Copy D

W. Z. FOSTER ON PANACEA MOVEMENTS (II)

The COMMUNIST

DECEMBER

FOR UNITY AGAINST THE AGGRESSORS

MANIFESTO OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

AFTER THE ELECTIONS

(REVIEW OF THE MONTH)

A. B.

AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY TRADITIONS

EARL BROWDER

THE PHILIPPINES MOBILIZE AGAINST JAPANESE AGGRESSION

ROY HUDSON ON THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION

RUDY BAKER ON PROSPECTS FOR VICTORY IN CHINA

TWENTY CENTS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GIFT BOOKS

FOR A PROGRESSIVE NEW YEAR!

THE PERIL OF FASCISM: THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
by A. B. Magil and Henry Stevens $2.00

THE NEGRO AND THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT
by James W. Ford $1.75

PROLETARIAN LITERATURE: AN ANTHOLOGY $1.00

RULERS OF AMERICA
by Anna Rochester $2.50

HANDBOOK OF MARXISM
edited by Emile Burns $1.75

FROM BRYAN TO STALIN
by William Z. Foster $2.50

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT
by Earl Browder $2.25

THE UNITED FRONT
by Georgi Dimitroff $2.00

RECONSTRUCTION: THE BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY
by James Allen $1.25

WORLD POLITICS
by R. Palme Dutt $2.00

THE FIRST AMERICAN REVOLUTION
by Jack Hardy ..... $ .75

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
edited by Gorky, Stalin and Others $1.25

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS
by Anthony Bimba $1.25

ENGELS ON CAPITAL $1.25

An Ideal Gift Book for Children:

CORKY, by Eric Lucas ..... 25 cents

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D — New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVII, No. 12 DECEMBER, 1938

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	1059
The 21st Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	1073
Concerning American Revolutionary Traditions	EARL BROWDER	1079
Panacea Mass Movements	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	1086
The A. F. of L. Convention and Tasks for Achieving Unity	ROY HUDSON	1094
A Powerful Ideological Weapon of Bolshevism		1105
The Fall of Wuhan and Prospects of China's Victory	RUDY BAKER	1114
The Philippines Mobilize Against Japanese Aggression	COMMUNIST PARTY, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS	1121
Party Building in the Northwest	LOUIS SASS	1132
Anent the American Medical Association	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	1137
From the World Communist Press		1141
Book Reviews	GIL GREEN	1144

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A. 209

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is the product of a fighting leader, not a specialist of the pen. It came right out of his activities on the firing line for his people and for the American working class," says ROBERT MINOR of—

THE NEGRO
AND THE
DEMOCRATIC FRONT

By James W. Ford

Written by an outstanding leader of the Negro people, this book is of great importance to everyone concerned with the Negro problem in the United States.

It deals with fundamental issues confronting the American Negro in the struggle for economic, political and social equality; with the need for unity of the Negro population and all other democratic forces in a common front against reaction, fascism and war; with the role of the Negro in American history and his fighting traditions and culture; with present-day campaigns in the South, in Harlem, in the Scottsboro case, in the trade union movement; with international questions of enormous significance to all Americans, Negro and white.

Since it is the work of one of the leaders of the American Communist Party, the volume is an authoritative statement of the many crucial problems of the day.

224 PAGES $1.75

★

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Finance Capital Promotes Reactionary Coalition for Next Congress. Real Meaning of Election Results. Do the People Want to Move to the Right? Masses Are Groping for a United Democratic Front. Party Realignment Lags Behind Social Realignment. Here Is the Key to Contradictory Election Results. Practical Concert of Action Is Need of Hour. Increased Importance of Progressive Elements in Republican Party. Third Party Is Today Not a Central Question. Beware of Proposals That Tend to Divide Progressive Forces. Communist Political Line and Party Building. The Amter Vote. Tasks of Progressives in Next Congress. Hitler's Pogroms and Anti-Semitism. Communist International Outlines Tasks and Policy. Leninism in Action. A Book on the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Fifteenth Anniversary of the Workers School.

EMBOLDENED by the advances of the Republican Party in the elections, many spokesmen of finance capital are now pressing for a reactionary bi-partisan Congressional coalition. Among the advocates of such a coalition are found the Landon "school" in the Republican Party, the *Herald Tribune*—champion of the "liberal" face tactic and also the "independent" Democratic organ—*The New York Times*. All of which is very significant.

Speculation in these circles pictures the outlook in the new Congress somewhat like this: since the Republican Party will hold about 170 seats in the House out of a total of 435, it would be sufficient for only 48 anti-New Deal Democrats to join with the Republicans to give the reactionary coalition a majority. Standing on this basis, the speculators at once discover a very pleasing perspective made up of two alternatives. Either the President, and all progressive forces, will have to capitulate to the reactionaries, or else assume responsibility for two years of governmental deadlock. In either event, so the speculators figure, the progressive forces can make no further legislative advances, while reaction will capitalize further on the restlessness of the people which such a situation must inevitably produce.

To which our immediate answer is: it is too simple, all too simple. There are as a matter of plain fact many more alternatives. And to see all of them in proper relationship, it is necessary to understand correctly the full meaning of the election results. What exactly did these results express as far as the mass of the people is concerned?

If you believe George Gallup, Director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, "the trend of Ameri-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can political sentiment today is unmistakably toward the Right." This flat statement is immediately invalidated or, at least, contradicted by the undeniable fact that the elections were not fought out everywhere and clearly on the issue of progress versus reaction or even liberalism versus conservatism, except in a few spots. In instance after instance the mass of the voters—the people—were called upon to make choices under conditions of utmost complexity and confusion which prevailed in the sphere of issues and political alignment. Where the Democratic Party candidate was unmistakably progressive and New Deal, he had to contend with the malodorous record of corruption and reaction of the local Democratic Party machine which the Republicans exploited to the utmost. Elsewhere the progressivism of the Democratic Party candidate himself was very dubious, differentiating him little (if any) from his Republican opponent, thus giving overbalancing weight to local and extraneous issues. Can it be maintained that, in the face of all this, the bulk of those who voted Republican have thereby signified their opposition to progress and a desire to turn to the Right? Ridiculous.

Ridiculous, ever more so, in the face of what Gallup himself has to say on the attitude of the mass of the people on *specific* issues. We will quote at length on this because it is so important. Says Gallup:

"Studies of public opinion have provided a measurement of the limits and the nature of the conservatism which has been manifested and a means of describing just what that conservatism will be. They indicate quite clearly, for example, that while the public may be moving to the Right, *it will never go back to the political philosophy of the nineteen twenties.*" (Our emphasis—*A. B.*)

In other words, the people do not want to go back to Hoover and the things he stands for. This, by the way, is a point which these columns have been making insistently in the past months. And doesn't this point *in itself,* when we realize its full meaning, seriously undermine the theory that, in these elections, the people have indicated a desire to move to the Right? What do you mean "to move to the Right"? This means not only moving away from progress and liberalism but moving *toward* something else. Moving towards reaction, moving *backwards to Hoover,* which is today possible only as a fascistic edition of Hoover, But Gallup himself says that the mass of the people do not want to move that way. Then, what is there left of the theory that the people want to turn to the Right? Mostly wishful thinking.

But we will let Gallup speak some more:

"A dozen or more surveys in the past two years have shown, for example, that even conservatives in the electorate have accepted many New Deal reforms. They are heartily in favor of the Securities and Exchange Commission, they have accepted the principle of federal unemployment relief, they approve of the type of work done by the Civilian Conservation Corps, they endorse the reciprocal trade treaty programs of Secretary Hull, and they favor the Social Security Act by an overwhelming majority."

Take this for the moment as Gallup serves it; does it indicate a desire by the people to turn to the Right? Of course not, if by the people are meant

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the workers, farmers and the bulk of the middle classes.

That this is so can be seen from many additional and revealing facts. Gallup says (in the quotation above) that the overwhelming majority of the people *have accepted* the Social Security Act. But this is an awfully misleading *understatement*. Of course, the people have accepted it, and Providence pity those who may be tempted to try to destroy it. But the people want *more* than that act offers them. They want a broader, more adequate act. *They want security.*

Proof? One finds it on all sides in the various pension and similar movements, even though some of their concrete measures are open to criticism from a progressive point of view.

What, for example, is the meaning of the fact that at least 28 of the Republicans elected to the House *are pledged* to the Townsend plan and that 19 more have demonstrated their sympathy for the plan? Townsend has endorsed all of these 47 Republicans to the House as well as six of the elected Republicans to the Senate. Many of these will undoubtedly try to break their pledges and betray the Townsend movement. But as far as the people are concerned, they have just as undoubtedly signified their desire for *more social security,* not less, by voting for these Republicans. And this is another point made repeatedly in these columns. Does this point, proven by the results of the elections, indicate that the mass of the people wish to turn to the Right? Obviously not.

Or take the Gallup findings on the more controversial issue of the Wagner Labor Act. The latest poll on the question "Do you think the Wagner Labor Act should be revised, repealed or left unchanged," made public on November 13, gives the following results: 52 per cent favor revision, 18 per cent favor repeal and 30 per cent favor leaving it unchanged. On the face of these findings, 82 per cent oppose repealing the act and only 18 per cent are in favor of repeal. This is very important because it again demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of the people are definitely backing the Wagner Labor Act. Even among the Republican voters, Gallup finds that 70 per cent oppose the repeal of the act.

It will be argued, of course, that revision of the act is favored by 52 per cent of the poll and, encouraged by that, the reactionaries will seek to emasculate it. But that will not be so easy. For the moment it will become evident to the wide masses, as it inevitably must, that "revision" in the hands of the reactionaries is but a nice-looking cover for their real aim, which is repeal and destruction of the act, from that moment on the camp of "revisionists" will begin melting away very rapidly.

And here is something else that proves our point. The "Proposition Number One," an initiative referendum submitted to the people of California in the November elections, was in essence an attempt to revise on a state scale the Wagner Labor Act. The Associated Farmers, a semi-fascist outfit of big business, which sponsored the measure, sought to win for it the farmers and middle classes. But what happened? The working farmers of the state, the real farmers, said

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no on this proposition, following the advice of the California State Grange. Labor was united against it. The progressive candidates in the elections equally took a determined stand of opposition. Result: the measure was defeated.

It would seem therefore that, *as far as the attitude of the people is concerned,* the electoral victories of the Republicans can by no means be interpreted as a desire of the masses to turn to the Right. The overwhelming majority continues to believe in the objectives of the New Deal, determined to maintain *and extend* the achievements gained under the Roosevelt administration. To understand how, in the face of this fact, the Republicans were able nevertheless to make the advances they did, one must turn to other angles of the situation.

* * *

According to Gallup, "unofficial estimates of last Tuesday's voting indicate a total Democratic Congressional vote of approximately 53 per cent. This compares with 59 per cent in 1936." A shift of six points. It is important to find out from what classes and groups this shift came.

It is certain that large numbers of the upper circles of the bourgeoisie, which still voted Democratic in the Congressional elections of 1936, voted Republican this year. These were undoubtedly the thousands of Democrats who, in the words of Landon, "joined in the protest against the Roosevelt policies which were wrecking their party and their country." The loss of these Democratic votes, if a loss it can be called, is part of the natural and desirable process of class realignment which is gradually and with various detours bringing the majority of the people on one side as against the reactionary circles of big business on the other. *The trouble is that the political and party realignment is still lagging so far behind the realignment in class forces.* And, as we shall see later, this is the key to an understanding of the results of the elections.

Really important are the shifts which occurred among certain groups of farmers and city middle classes. It is generally agreed that large groups of farmers have voted Republican in protest against low farm prices. Not against the progressive New Deal farm legislation but against its *inadequacies.*

Writing to *The New York Times* from Kansas City, John M. Collins says: "It was more a revolt against low prices than against a national farm policy with its subsidies." (November 13.) It is also safe to assume that the economic difficulties of the city middle classes have moved certain sections of them to cast a similar protest vote.

The offensive of finance capital upon the people in the present crisis, *insufficiently combatted by the progressive forces,* is producing certain strains in the relationships between the workers, farmers and city middle classes. What is the offensive of finance capital doing? It is throwing the burden of the crisis upon the people. The result is what we have: unemployment for the workers, low prices and decreasing income for the farmers, and undermined economic existence for the middle classes. There is no doubt (and the masses know it) that under the Roosevelt administration the people have managed to pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tect themselves from the onslaughts of finance capital better than at any other time. But the crisis is here and so is the offensive of big business. Therefore, something was bound to happen. In the absence of a *consolidated* common front of the progressive forces *of all parties*, fighting unitedly for an adequate program to make the monopolies pay for the crisis and to curb their power—in the absence of such a common democratic front which alone can unite our people against reaction—certain other things inevitably result. Reaction steps in and begins to insert wedges between the workers, farmers and middle classes. Assuming in many places a liberal face, the self-same reaction successfully exploits the desire of the people for more progressive legislation for the purpose of defeating progressive candidates. And this is, *in part*, what happened in the elections on November 8.

Organized labor succeeded on the whole in maintaining a gratifying degree of united action despite the machinations of the reactionaries. It can also be said that the bulk of labor supported progressive candidates in the elections. But labor by itself cannot do the whole job, in the face of the still existing divisions in the trade union movement and the even greater lack of unity and cooperation among the other progressive forces and between these and labor.

"Assuredly," said John L. Lewis, "labor of itself cannot sustain the prestige of the Democratic organization in any state, where the conduct of that organization and its officers is not such as to warrant the confidence of the electors." Lewis was referring here to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and certain areas in other states. Developing his position further, Lewis said:

> "Unquestionably the great majority of the people of this country are overwhelmingly behind President Roosevelt and his general policy. Unquestionably the American people have no reason to return to the Republican Party which for years past has done nothing but betray the interests of the common people."

This is absolutely true. And its meaning in terms of class relationships is that the workers, farmers and middle classes are in the process of crystallizing a progressive and democratic coalition against the reactionary offensive of finance capital. It is this mighty process, down below, which is moving the political and party realignment in the country. But—and this is the main point to consider now—the realignment of parties and party affiliations *has not kept pace* with the realignment of the mass of the people on political issues and social objectives. There are still many powerful reactionaries in the Democratic Party, enemies of the New Deal who are of the same political coloration as the reactionary core of the Republican Party. On the other hand, there is a constantly increasing number of progressively-minded people in the Republican Party, people of substantially the same political coloration as the progressive forces in the Democratic Party.

One of the outstanding features in the election results is the demonstration of the fact that the number of progressive-minded people in the Republican Party is increasing. This trend has been evident for some time.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It showed itself convincingly in the primary elections during the summer months. Reactionary finance capital made use of it to give more effectiveness to the "liberal face" tactic which sought to cover up *the reactionary core* of the Republican Party. But the progressive elements in both major parties—Democratic and Republican—made some but very little use of this fact to create a common front of all progressive forces against reaction. Therefore, because such a common consolidated democratic front was not in existence in the elections, substantial sections of the people, mainly among the farmers and middle classes, simply couldn't find that effective *political instrument* to express adequately their protests, desires and demands.

Lack of collaboration between the progressive forces in both major parties is one angle of the question. Another one, and perhaps more important, is the insufficient collaboration of these progressive forces in the major parties *with the independent organizations of the masses themselves,* especially with labor. The process of this collaboration has been sadly lagging, although significant achievements have been made in this sphere in some parts of the country and universally with successful results in the elections.

The Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party (June, 1938) analyzed the situation and trends in the country as follows:

"Against the reactionary and fascist offensive, the forces of democracy are organizing themselves and more and more gathering into a common front. Especially important from this viewpoint is the deepening struggle of the progressives against the reactionaries in the Democratic Party and the growing differentiation in the Republican Party whose progressive sections are moving in the direction of a common democratic front. These forces are drawn into closer collaboration with the growing independent organizations and political activities of the workers, farmers, middle classes and Negroes, such as Labor's Non-Partisan League, the American Labor Party, the Farmer-Labor Party, the Progressive Party of Wisconsin, the Washington Commonwealth Federation, the National Negro Congress, etc."*

The conclusion drawn was that *"it is necessary to unify and consolidate all labor and progressive forces into one single democratic front."*

Much undoubtedly has been achieved along these lines. And the Communist Party, working for the realization of this aim, has been collaborating with all who were really for it to bring about the desired results. Yet, the fact nevertheless remains that the "single democratic front" has not been in existence during the elections except in some places. The process of party and political realignment leading to the common democratic front was moving forward. Of this there can be no doubt. But it was *lagging* behind the faster process of class and social realignments. This is the key to an understanding of the election results. This is also the key to the solution of the chief problem facing the camp of democracy in this country today. *It is the organization of the single democratic front.* We wish to emphasize the idea of "organization." The forces are here; the social line-up is also here; the need is urgent and immediate; the job is to organize.

* *Resolutions of the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A.*, p. 5. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOHN L. LEWIS, it seems to us, has put the essentials of the matter clearly and correctly. He said:

"I think, on the whole, the general election indicates substantially the need for greater cooperation and a more practical concert of action of the liberal forces in our country. I think the liberal elements in the Democratic Party, labor and the progressives, have been given an incentive to cooperate."

Important here is, of course, the general idea of greater cooperation between the progressive forces in the Democratic Party, the increased number of progressive elements in the Republican Party, and the decisive independent organizations of labor, the farmers, and the middle classes. But the stress, as we see it, is on *"a more practical concert of action"* of all these forces. Not to take it anymore for granted that simply because all these forces belong together in a political way, and just because they are facing the same enemy (the offensive of finance capital) and are moving in the same direction, they will necessarily and *automatically* be pulling together *at any given moment*. Not at all. They have not done so everywhere in these elections. And that's why the results are not so favorable as they could have been. Therefore the need of a *more practical* concert of action, *an organized one*, one that will stand out unmistakably before the people as the symbol and instrument of their united action. *A single democratic front.*

Finance capital naturally fears such a common front and does all in its power to prevent its coming into being. Big business still clings to its idea of the "traditional" two-party system, both parties controlled by finance capital, and functioning merely as ins and outs. But this system is undergoing far-reaching changes due directly to the New Deal strength in the Democratic Party and the growth of progressive elements in the Republican Party. So, while seeking desperately to re-establish its control in the Democratic Party and to strengthen its domination in the Republican Party, and in order to achieve these aims, finance capital feels compelled to resort to additional measures. It promotes *coalitions*, informal but effective none the less, of the reactionaries of both major parties against the people. It promotes such coalitions yet insists upon the "sanctity" of old party labels and the rigidity of old major party divisions.

This is obviously a complicated game but its purpose is relatively plain. It is to obstruct the organization of a single democratic front by keeping the progressive forces in the two major parties disunited while encouraging and promoting united action of the *reactionaries* in these two parties. For example: the same *New York Times* which, through its news columns, presses for a reactionary coalition of Democrats and Republicans in the coming Congress, which means calling upon Democrats to split their party delegation in Congress and join with the opponent party, this same paper editorially advises the Republicans in Congress to stick together and maintain party unity. Says the *Times*:

"If the Republican opposition is to impress the country, *there must be intelligent unity in it.*" (November 13, 1938. Our emphasis—*A. B.*)

Another little trick of the same

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

game is this: *The New York Times,* known as an independent Democratic organ, supported Governor Lehman for reelection in New York but opposed the Democratic Party's candidates for the Senate—Wagner and Mead. In other words, the *Times* split the unity of its own party, joining the reactionaries in the Republican Party, but to the Republicans it offers the advice of "intelligent unity." And what does this "intelligent" unity mean? It can mean only one thing. It is an effort to prevent progressive Republicans in the House and there are such), and progressive-*minded* Republicans (of these, there are more), as well as such Republicans as may feel reluctant to violate their progressive pledges to the voters—to prevent all these Republicans in the new Congress from joining with the progressive Democrats to protect the interests of the people against the offensive of reaction. It is to prevent the organization of a single democratic front in Congress and outside.

Yet this democratic front is precisely the thing the people need. They need it now *especially to win the progressive-minded elements in the Republican Party* to united action with the New Deal and all other progressive forces. The increased Republican strength, and the growing number of progressive elements in the Republican Party, make the common democratic front both more possible and more necessary.

It is evident that progressive forces everywhere are today giving a good deal of thought to this problem. President Roosevelt himself has, during the primaries, given expression to the need of a political realignment along liberal lines as against reaction, opening up a line of struggle against the reactionaries in his own party. Following the elections, Mayor LaGuardia together with Governor Murphy and others have canvassed, as reported in the press, the outlook and possibilities for united progressive action. John L. Lewis, as quoted in the foregoing, voiced the opinion of labor on some of these problems. Clearly, the realization exists that there must be organized a practical concert of action of labor, the New Deal forces, the progressive elements in the Republican Party and all the independent organizations of the farmers and middle classes.

Naturally, as this question is beginning to be tackled in a practical way, differences on specific angles of it will become manifest. This is inevitable at the moment and not of itself dangerous. *Provided, however, that the question of "a third party" is not placed in the center of things.* The first reason for this is that the "third party" question is today *not a central question.* It may become so in the future, and nobody can say now in what form it will appear, if it does. The second reason is that, artificially making the "third party" question the central one, immediately tends *to divide* the progressive forces of various parties instead of uniting them. And the third reason is the evident fact that the *real central* task is the organization of "a practical concert of action" of all progressive forces in all parties and independent people's movements (Lewis). And this is the task that has to be tackled at once.

This is not to say that the organization of this practical concert of action

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—the single democratic front—will not bring forth some difficult problems upon which there may not be initial differences of opinion. Most assuredly such problems and differences already exist. But these will be hammered out and solved if the central task is correctly formulated: the task of organizing the practical concert of action of labor, the farmers, the middle classes by bringing together their independent organizations with the forces of the New Deal and the progressive elements in the Republican Party. From this standpoint, the advances of the American Labor Party in New York are most encouraging.

A united labor movement, made nearer by the convention of the C.I.O. and, as a consequence, a greater labor *initiative* in bringing about the organization of the single democratic front—these are the urgent needs of the moment.

Encouraged by the proven correctness of the main line of the Party and by the significant contributions made by it to the cause of the democratic forces in the elections, Communists will proceed more energetically with the struggle for the unity of the working class and the common democratic front. More Party members will engage in active political work. Party branches and units—the base of our Party—will more effectively develop their daily work *as centers of leadership* for the masses in their respective jurisdictions. Recruiting and press circulation will be promoted more systematically. Remembering the fine Amter vote in New York and the estimated 120,000 votes for Anita Whitney in California, which demonstrate the growing appreciation of the masses for the important work of our Party and its vanguard role, Communists will more confidently press *the building of the Party in all its phases.* They will also not overlook the opportunity of establishing better relationships with all those honest Socialists whose eyes have been opened by the Norman Thomas debacle in New York to the semi-Trotskyism and vicious sectarianism of present Socialist Party policies.

All of this—in order to help realize more fully "labor's initiative in gathering the farmers, the middle classes and all progressives into the general democratic front." Resolution, (Tenth Convention of the Communist Party.)

* * *

PREPARATIONS for the opening of the new Congress in January are in order. Present indications are that the reactionary coalition will seek to initiate its legislative offensive with attacks on the relief measures of the New Deal and the W.P.A., with proposals to revise (read: destroy) the Wagner Labor Act, and with a string of fascistic measures now being cooked in the kitchen of Representative Dies.

It is almost certain that the reactionaries will, at the beginning, shy away from touching the agrarian situation. Nor will they dare to precipitate action on the Social Security Act. These are "hot potatoes" for the reactionaries.

This alone would seem to indicate that the progressive forces must seek to make *social security* the main and general order of business of the new Congress from the very outset: The broadening of the Social Security Act and the hastening of its application.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adequate agrarian measures to meet the needs of the farmers. Adequate measures for relief to meet the needs of the unemployed. A national people's health program. It is absolutely essential that all of these divisions of providing more security for the people *be closely integrated* as main parts of a general program of social security with a corresponding *budget and taxation policy*, based upon ability to pay, to meet adequately the needs of the masses.

Under no circumstances must the reactionary forces be allowed to single out just one phase of the program, say unemployment relief, in the hope of breaking up the solidarity of the people behind social security as a whole.

Besides, the economic and international outlook is such as to make it imperative upon the next Congress to deal at once with the basic problems of recovery and security in the broadest aspects as well as with the problems of world security against the extending aggressions of the fascist war-makers. We speak here of the economic crisis and of the consequences of the Munich conspiracy as it affects this country.

On the economic outlook, the November bulletin of the Federal Reserve has this illuminating observation to make:

"The most recent increases in output have brought production in some industries up to the level of current consumption, and a further rise will depend to a considerable extent on how far the effects of recovery to date prove cumulative *and particularly when and to what extent the improvement in business leads to larger expenditures for durable goods by the public utilities, the railroads, and industry at large.*" (Our emphasis—*A. B.*)

In plainer words, this means that, unless the sit-down strike of big capital is broken, the present recovery movement will have to come to a stop. Therefore now is the time to begin doing something about it, before the stop actually comes, especially as capitalist economy generally is facing a new world economic crisis. We have indicated many times what has to be done, within the limitations of capitalism, to break the sabotage of big business and to promote recovery. It is to limit the power of big business in the economy and government of the country. The overwhelming majority of the people desire such a course. The progressive forces in the new Congress are therefore duty bound to initiate measures to that effect (utilizing for the purpose the anti-monopoly investigation) in order to be able to solve more effectively the practical problems of social security. The nationalization of the railroads, the banks and the munitions industries are clearly indicated as *vital measures* for the promotion of recovery and extension and consolidation of social security.

With this is inextricably bound up the task of meeting the menacing consequences of the Munich conspiracy. This calls for immediate action to scotch the projects of Chamberlain and his friends to impose Munich settlements upon Spain and China. Lifting the embargo from Republican Spain, helping to feed the Spanish people, embargoing the aggressors and rendering all possible aid to the Chinese people, at the same time developing more consistently the Good-Neighbor policy in Latin America—these are parts of a program of resisting the fascist aggressors and of encouraging the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peoples of other countries to join in this common task. Above all, the development and consolidation of the friendship between the peoples and governments of the United States and the Soviet Union is the major part of any program of national security.

Social security and national security, bound together in one general program, and fought for by a united democratic front in Congress and in the country at large, will create an unbreakable unity of the people, advancing effectively the cause of jobs, security, democracy and peace against the offensive of reaction, fascism and war.

* * *

GERMAN fascism has demonstrated once more the value of Chamberlain's "appeasement." This time it was the Jewish people in Germany who paid the price. The world will not soon forget—cannot forget—this fresh manifestation of fascist barbarism and degeneracy. It is another consequence of the Munich betrayal.

Jew-baiting and anti-Semitism always were the last (or first) refuge of the reactionary scoundrel. Fascism is refining it to a cruel art which outdoes everything known of the Dark Ages. When, therefore, Jew-baiting raises its ugly head anywhere, it is a danger signal, a signal that fascism is making a way for itself. The American people must take that lesson close to heart.

Anti-Semitism is directed against the Jewish people, but not only against them, as everybody knows. Anti-Semitism today is the harbinger of fascism. This must not be forgotten. And in the United States, the scourge of Jew-baiting carries a special danger. It undermines the national structure of the country. By inciting race against race, creed against creed, one national group against another, anti-Semitism seeks to destroy the American nation. And this is what fascism is aiming at. It is clear, therefore, that the struggle against anti-Semitism, in all its manifestations, is an inseparable part of the central struggle against reaction and fascism.

* * *

AS THE consequences of the Munich betrayal unfold themselves, it is becoming evident to ever broader circles of the people that we are dealing here with a wide imperialist conspiracy. What is perhaps not yet so fully clear to many is that this conspiracy resulted from and is resting upon a counter-revolutionary alliance concluded by the imperialist cliques of Britain and France with German and Italian fascism. This is how the Executive Committee of the Communist International states the matter in its manifesto on the twenty-first anniversary of the socialist revolution:

"In their mortal hatred of socialism, of the international working class, of every democratic movement, the imperialist cliques of Britain and France concluded a counter-revolutionary alliance with German and Italian fascism."*

This is a development of the capitulation and "appeasement" policies of the Chamberlains in every capitalist country. It is the orientation of the pro-fascist circles of the bourgeoisie everywhere. From this fact, Comrade Dimitroff draws the conclusion:

"The most important lesson of the recent

* See p. 1074 of this issue.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

events is precisely that *unless the reactionary imperialist cliques and capitulators in one's own country are curbed, it is imposible to curb the fascist brigands, it is impossible to conduct a successful struggle in defense of the freedom and independence of the peoples and to defend world peace.*" *

To gain a clear understanding of the present role of the pro-fascist circles of the bourgeoisie, and how to combat them, is of the utmost theoretical and practical importance. Marxism-Leninism will guide us toward that end.

From the book which recently appeared in the Soviet Union (of which six million copies have been sold)—*A Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union***—we can gain the guidance we need. For this book was prepared under the direct and closest cooperation of our greatest teacher, Stalin. This work presents Leninism in action, the theory of Marxism-Leninism in the making and development. We shall soon have an American edition of it.

This book finds that the so-called democratic states do not approve of the "excesses" of the fascist states and are fearful of seeing the latter strengthened. "But they are still more fearful of the labor movement of Europe and of the national liberation movements of Asia, believing that fascism is 'a good antidote' to all these 'dangerous' movements." (Russian edition, page 319.)

Consequently the ruling circles of the democratic states, particularly the ruling Conservative circles of England, confine themselves to a policy of appeasing the mad beast of fascism. trying to persuade it "not to go to extremes," intimating at the same time that they "understand fully" and in the main sympathize with the fascist policy of serving as a reactionary policeman against the labor and national liberation movements. (*Ibid.*)

Inevitably one is reminded of the behavior of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie of tsarist Russia.

According to the book, "the ruling circles of England are here holding to approximately the same policy as was held by the Russian liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie under tsarism." Fearful of "the extremes" of tsarism, this liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie was still more fearful of the people. "It therefore passed over to a policy of appeasing the tsar, consequently to a policy of *coming to terms* with the tsar against the people." (*Ibid.*) The liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie of Russia, as is well known, paid heavily for such a double-dealing policy. It is to be expected, therefore, that the ruling circles of England and their friends in France and in the United States will receive from history their deserved due.

To equip ourselves effectively for the task of helping to make the history which will give the pro-fascist bourgeoisie its due is our job, the job of the working class and its vanguard. This means first a correct policy on combatting the conspiracies of the capitulators to fascism. And here too we can learn a lesson from the history of Leninism, from that period of its development when it was meeting the problems of the first phase of the Russian Revolution.

* "The United Front Against Fascism—After the Munich Conspiracy." *Daily Worker*, November 14.

** See p. 1105 of this issue.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That was the period from 1903 to the beginning of March, 1917, the bourgeois-democratic phase of the revolution, when the main aim was the overthrow of tsarism and the abolition of all remnants of feudalism. The essential force of the revolution was the working class, with the peasantry as its nearest ally. And what was the chief line of attack of the Bolshevik Party? It was *to isolate the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie which was trying to come to terms with tsarism.*

Learning from these great experiences, from the theory of Marxism-Leninism, we therefore say with the Executive Committee of the Communist International:

"The fascist aggressors, who have cast off all restraint, cannot be curbed unless a resolute struggle is undertaken against the capitulators in one's own country."

Curb the reactionary imperialist cliques and capitulators in your own country—this is the lesson.

And another lesson—on the role of the working class in the present world situation. Speaking of the consequences of the Munich conspiracy, Dimitroff writes:

"What is at issue is not only the redistribution of the existing colonial possessions, but the repartition of Europe itself, the colonization of a number of European states and the imperialist enslavement of a number of European peoples."*

This is what the pro-fascist bourgeoisie in the democratic countries, the reactionary imperialist cliques and capitulators are helping fascism to undertake, betraying the interests of their own countries. This is one trend in international politics. But there is another one. It is the united front of the working class, the united front of all peoples against the bandit Munich agreement, against fascist aggression, in defense of world peace. In this situation, the working class has a special task to perform. Says the Communist International:

"At the time when fascism has already set about the repartition of Europe, when it is crippling other peoples and tearing them to pieces, *the task of the working class now is to head the liberation struggle of the enslaved nations and the defense of the peoples threatened by foreign domination.*"

And who is the nation?

"The nation is not the gang of fascists, reactionary financiers and industrial magnates who rob and betray the people. The nation is the many millions of workers, peasants and working people generally—the people that is devoted to its country, cherishes its liberty and defends its independence. Just as in Spain and China where the people are fighting with arms in hand, and in Austria and Czechoslovakia—so also in all countries menaced with fascist invasion from without, only the working class can rally, rouse and lead the people to a victorious struggle for national liberation. The working class is the backbone of the nation, the bulwark of its liberty, dignity and independence."

For this we need a united working class heading a united people. And to the accomplishment of this task we must devote ourselves with ever greater energy and consistency.

* * *

OUR greetings and best wishes to the Workers School on its fifteenth anniversary, to its director,

* "The United Front Against Fascism—After the Munich Conspiracy." *Daily Worker*, November 14.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comrade Markoff, to its instructors and staff and to all its friends.

As an institution of Marxist education for workers, the Workers School occupies in the general educational movements of the country the most progressive and forward-looking place. The reason for this is that Marxism-Leninism is the most progressive and advanced *science*. It is the science of the development of society, the science of the labor movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of the communist society.

To the extent therefore that the Workers School is successfully fulfilling its task of spreading Marxist education among the workers, it is rendering the labor movement invaluable service. It is helping to equip the working class with greater knowledge and ability for the solution of the complicated problems of the present period. It is thus helping the working class to move forward to a position of leadership in the great struggle of the people to resist fascist aggression to block the road to fascism in this country, to preserve and develop democracy.

More power to you, comrades of the Workers School, in the broader and more effective propagation of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism whose greatest living teacher is Comrade Stalin.

A. B.

"The American Negro's culture cannot be dissociated from his struggle against slavery, and against the acute economic exploitation and attendant evils which have their source in the survival of the plantation economy in the South. The tradition of the Negro has been the tradition of revolt against his oppressors."

James W. Ford, *The Negro and the Democratic Front*, p. 190.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE 21st ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

MANIFESTO OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, ISSUED ON NOVEMBER 7, 1938

PROLETARIANS AND WORKING PEOPLE OF ALL LANDS!

Today the Soviet people mark the twenty-first year of their great socialist revolution, of their heroic struggle, of their world historic victories.

At the time when the peoples of the Soviet republic are completing the construction of classless socialist society and are advancing full of confidence towards communism, the capitalist world is in the throes of an ominous war fever.

The second imperialist war, a robber war for a new repartition of the earth, has in fact already begun. It is already raging in various corners of the globe. In Spain and in China the fascist butchers are doing their abominable work. Over 500,000,000 human beings have been hurled into the abyss of bloody destruction. War threatens to spread to new territories and so involve new peoples. Hundreds of millions of people are menaced with attack by the fascist beasts of prey.

Never yet, as during these days of fascist brigandage, have the masses of the people of the capitalist countries had such a strong and profound feeling of their blood-bond with the great land of socialism. The peoples see in the U.S.S.R. the bulwark of their struggle for liberty and independence, the embodiment of their age-old aspirations. They see that the Soviet people, thanks to the proletarian dictatorship, have withstood a host of enemies, have maintained and consolidated their independence, have built socialism.

* * *

Towering aloft like a rock of granite before millions of people in the capitalist world, which is in the grip of confusion and disintegration and is on the threshold of a new economic crisis, is the land of victorious socialism. Conscious of its strength, the Soviet land pursues its path with resolute and tranquil step. The justness of its cause constitutes its greatness. Its hand is formidable to enemies and will not fail to succor friends. Its Stalinist word is inviolable. It is with confidence that it looks into its future. Inexhaustible are the material and moral forces of the Soviet land.

The gigantic scope of socialist industry, the enormous progress of the collective farms, the growing prosperity of the masses, the blossoming of a life that is full of joy and happiness

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—all these have united the Soviet people with communism forever.

The unity of the workers and peasants, the unity of the people and the Bolshevik Party, and the Soviet government, the unity of the nationalities that inhabit the U.S.S.R., the unity of the working people throughout the world and their great fatherland—render the Soviet power an invincible force. The glorious Party of Lenin and Stalin embodied and consolidated this moral and political unity of the Soviet people in the great Stalin Constitution, that charter of nationwide socialist democracy.

The Soviet land will yield to no one its achievements, its inexhaustible riches. The frontiers of the Soviet country are inviolable. On the borders of the U.S.S.R. there stands, unyielding, the strongest army in the world, the Red Army of socialism. By the lesson it taught the Japanese cutthroats at Lake Khasan it provided a clear example of how the cause of peace should be defended. By wiping out the gang of Trotskyite-Bukharinite spies, the Soviet people teaches how one should conduct the struggle against traitors, capitulators and enemies of the people. By its unswerving loyalty to the obligations it had undertaken, the Soviet government, during the Czechoslovakian crisis, showed how agreements should be kept and collective security defended. Only the Soviet people supported and continues to support the Spanish people against the violence of the plunderers and the treachery of their accomplices. Only the Soviet Union stretches out a helping hand to the Chinese people. Only the land of the proletarian dictatorship, supremely, with Stalinist courage and stalwartness, upholds the cause of liberty throughout the world.

The great material power of socialism gathers strength with every hour. Millions of working people everywhere are turning towards it. The revolutionizing influence of socialism over the peoples is a source of fear to world reaction. World reaction wishes to turn back the wheel of history. It is unleashing the wild fascist beast against the land of socialism, against its own peoples. In their mortal hatred of socialism, of the international working class, of every democratic movement, the imperialist cliques of Britain and France concluded a counter-revolutionary alliance with German and Italian fascism. The Munich agreement *was not only a blow at Czechoslovakia.* It is a far wider imperialist conspiracy. It is a conspiracy against the small nations which Britain and France are betraying to the fascist plunderers. It is a conspiracy against the Spanish republic, whose heroic people they wish to place in bondage to the German and Italian violators. It is an onslaught on the French people around whose neck German and Italian fascism are drawing the noose ever tighter. It is an onslaught on the British people against whom war is being prepared by its age-old enemy—German imperialism. It is a treacherous blow against the German people, whose enslavement becomes severer the greater the concessions made to the hangmen of the working people of Germany. It is against the people's front movement, against the international proletariat that the Munich conspiracy is directed. It is against *world peace* that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the blow is directed by the Munich conspirators, who come forward hypocritically in the role of "saviors of peace."

Not peace was saved by the British and French reactionaries; what they did was to save German fascism from collapse. They strengthened Hitler's position for the conduct of a major war.

* * *

Workers!

Was it possible to preserve peace and avert the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia?

Yes, comrades, it was!

Neither from the military nor the economic point of view was Hitler Germany ready for war. It was lacking in raw materials, foodstuffs, and financial resources. Its fortifications were not completed. Its army did not possess trained personnel in sufficient quantity. The rear of German fascism constituted a terrible danger to it. The German people had no desire for war. They were filled with deep discontent. A wave of popular indignation threatened, if war broke out, to sweep away the fascist adventurers.

Ranged against Germany were forces on whose side was the overwhelming preponderance. Czechoslovakia possessed an excellent army and was protected by a system of first-class fortresses. The British and French fleets were in a position to ensure the blockade of Germany. Action by the Soviet Union would have given rise to a powerful wave of the anti-fascist movement in defense of the *just* cause of the peoples. Faced by such forces, *German fascism would have had no alternative but to retreat.* But the British bourgeoisie who dragged France in the wake of their policy did not want to permit this political defeat of the fascist gendarme of Europe. Britain and France did everything possible to compel Czechoslovakia to capitulate. By exerting unheard of pressure, by supporting the German blackmail, by threatening to take the side of Germany, they succeeded in getting the Czech government to accept the bandit ultimatum of German fascism.

The Munich conspiracy took place because the reactionary bourgeoisie decided to resist by every means the formation of an international peace front together with the Soviet Union. Not at any price would they permit a powerful movement of the peoples against fascism. Having in advance come to agreement with the German fascists, and having distributed the roles, the British reactionaries organized the deception of the peoples with the aid of the farce of ostentatious military mobilization in Britain and France. The Munich conspiracy was able to take place because the hypocritical advocates of French "democracy" preferred cowardly *capitulation* to a policy of resisting the aggressor, because the capitulators broke the determination of the peoples to struggle by sanctimoniously preaching the pacifist creed of peace at any price. The Munich conspiracy was facilitated by the fact that the working class, as a result of the splitting, capitulatory policy of the leaders of the Second International, was unable to muster its forces so as to frustrate the criminal conspiracy of German fascism and of British reaction.

Proletarians, working people!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, when millions of people are asking themselves what is the way out of the situation created by the Munich conspiracy, we Communists say: *The policy of capitulation did not and does not save peace. It has already led to war.* Ethiopia and Spain, Manchuria and China, Austria and Czechoslovakia—such are the blood-stained landmarks of this policy, of the policy of concessions to fascism. By weakening the peace forces, by strengthening the fascist aggressors, it helps them to unleash new, even more destructive wars, brings closer a monstrous conflagration of world imperialist war. There is only one way by which to save peace, namely, the way of resolute struggle against the fascist aggressor.

He who does not fight for peace cannot avert war.

To fight for peace means that in *each country* the liberty of the people must be defended against the reactionary bourgeoisie. Just as the feudal nobility during the period of the collapse of feudalism plotted with the enemies of France against the French republic, so now in the epoch of decaying capitalism, the reactionary bourgeoisie in alliance with German fascism are brandishing the sword over the heads of their own peoples.

A successful fight for peace cannot be conducted unless ruthless blows are dealt at those who betray their country and their people. The fascist aggressors, who have cast off all restraint, cannot be curbed unless a resolute struggle is undertaken against the capitulators in one's own country.

The peoples cannot entrust the fate of their countries to governments which conspire with foreign fascism against their own peoples. They cannot entrust either the defense of the country or armaments to such governments. It is against the working class, against all laboring people, against the liberation struggle of other peoples that these reactionary governments will direct their guns.

The condition for a successful struggle to strengthen the cause of peace is to replace the governments of national treachery and shame in the countries menaced by fascist blows from without, by governments that are ready to repulse the fascist aggressors. A government of real national salvation cannot pursue the ruinous path of capitulation. It will conduct a ruthless struggle against capitulators and agents of foreign fascism. It will ruthlessly crush the fascist machinations of reaction at home. It will purge the army of the fascist enemies of its own people. It will establish real control by the working class over the defense of the country. It will disarm the fascist leagues and make the working class organizations the mainstay of the country's defense. It will conduct a consistent policy of collective security and will not shrink from employing sanctions against the aggressor. With the aid of such governments, that are ready to use armed force in defense of the liberty and the independence of their peoples, it will be possible for a firm front of the peoples to arise which will compel the fascist aggressors to respect frontiers and keep the peace.

Only through the medium of *an alliance of peoples conducting a self-sacrificing struggle for the cause of peace* is it possible to frustrate the criminal plans of the instigators of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war. A defense cordon of armed peoples who have joined their forces with the great Soviet people will doom fascism to impotence and hasten on its defeat and its inevitable ruin.

At the time when fascism has already set about the repartition of Europe, when it is crippling other peoples and tearing them to pieces, *the task of the working class now is to head the liberation struggle of the enslaved nations and the defense of the peoples threatened by foreign domination.* The nation is not the gang of fascists, reactionary financiers and industrial magnates who rob and betray the people. The nation is the many millions of workers, peasants and working people generally—the people that is devoted to its country, cherishes its liberty and defends its independence. Just as in Spain and China where the people are fighting with arms in hand, and in Austria and Czechoslovakia, so also in all countries menaced with fascist invasion from without, only the working class can rally, rouse and lead the people to a victorious struggle for national liberation. The working class is the backbone of the nation, the bulwark of its liberty, dignity and independence.

* * *

Workers!

Do not let yourselves be led astray by the treachery of the bourgeois politicians to the people's front. Let the traitors break with the people's front movement. Their departure will only be a gain to it. You are faced with a big and noble task—not only to *strengthen* but also to *extend* the front of the people. New people and new sections of the population, who do not barter the fate of their country and their people, will join with you in the struggle against reactionary traitors, in the struggle *to save the people.*

Who can hammer out this broad front against fascist brigandage? *Only a united working class.*

The working class is the greatest force in modern society. It is the real master of the world, if it is united.

In the face of the international conspiracy of fascism, *international working class unity* has become a matter that brooks no delay. The Communist International carries on an unceasing struggle for this unity. It has repeatedly made the proposal to the Labor and Socialist International to establish united action by the international working class. Millions of workers throughout the world demand unity. Unity is desired by many Social-Democratic and trade union organizations. But this unity is not wanted by the reactionary leaders entrenched in the leadership of the Second International and in a number of Social-Democratic Parties and trade unions. They systematically disrupt the formation of a united, anti-fascist, working class fighting front. It is they who, while retreating step by step before fascism, conduct a shameless, slanderous campaign against the land of socialism. It is they who gather up with a solicitous hand from the cesspool of fascism the Trotskyite agents of the Gestapo, whom they allow to do wrecking work in the labor movement with impunity. It is they who, by their policy of non-intervention, have helped the hangmen who seek to strangle republican Spain. It is they who, without protest, accepted the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Munich ultimatum, hypocritically declaring it to be a supreme victory for the cause of peace. It is they who, after Munich, continue the same policy of splits and capitulation, the policy of disintegrating the labor movement. Without a daily and resolute struggle against these enemies of working class unity, these agents of the bourgeoisie, it is impossible to achieve the cohesion of the ranks of the proletariat. Now it is not enough to declare oneself a supporter of unity; now one must boldly put it into immediate practice on a local scale, as our Spanish brothers have done.

Working class unity—in the name of the peoples who are oppressed by fascism; in the name of the liberation struggle of the Austrian people against alien domination, of the struggle of the peoples of Czechoslovakia against the dismemberment of their country, and against the arbitrary conduct of German imperialism.

Working class unity—in the name of the heroic Spanish people, against whom the conspirators of Munich are preparing the next blow. *Arms and foodstuffs for the fighting Spanish republic!* Lift the shameful blockade! Drive the German and Italian interventionists from Spanish territory.

Working class unity—in the name of the heroic Chinese people. *Support China with arms and credits!* Economic sanctions against the Japanese aggressor! No war materials, no credits for the Japanese plunderer!

Working class unity—in the name of the workers' most urgent interests, in the name of all the peoples whose independence is menaced by German fascism, in the name of peace which is at stake!

Proletarians of all lands, unite, so as to lay the foundation of unity of the peoples against fascist aggression!

Proletarians, working people of all countries, strengthen the fraternal fighting alliance with the great Soviet people.

The U.S.S.R. is the impregnable fortress of socialism, the guarantee of the oncoming victory of the international working class.

The U.S.S.R. is a powerful buttress of peace and fraternity between the peoples.

The land of victorious socialism is an indestructible bulwark of the peoples throughout the world in the struggle against fascist enslavement.

Long live the great Soviet Union, the fortress of socialism, liberty and of the independence of the peoples!

Long live international working class unity!

Long live the Spanish people, fighting with arms in hand in defense of their liberty!

Long live the Chinese people, waging a liberation struggle for their independence!

Long live the people's front against fascism in all countries!

Long live the world-wide front of the peoples against the fascist aggressors!

Long live socialism!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONCERNING AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY TRADITIONS

BY EARL BROWDER

One of the most serious contributions made by the Communist Party to the American people, first of all the working class, has been its leading role in the general rediscovery of American history, with the revitalization of the democratic and revolutionary traditions that followed. During the past three years the Party has proved the correctness of its claim to be the inheritor of the revolutionary traditions of America.

The proof that this rediscovery of American history is a living force among the masses, that it arises from the needs of the national and world situation, is to be seen in the fact that it has already involved the broadest circles of intellectual life and all political tendencies. When a nation faces a great crisis, it first of all looks back over the past to see what it can learn to help solve new problems. Even the most fascist-inclined circles have plunged into the stream: witness the recent attempt to revaluate Aaron Burr and raise him from the depths of ignominy as the symbol of treason upon to the heights of chief hero of the American revolution—a typical Trotskyite formula applied to American history for openly fascist ends. The liberal and democratic bourgeois intellectuals are also rereading their history, gaining new perspectives and understanding, and producing much new material; its value is uneven, it is true, but the balance sheet will already show a big advance.

It is becoming necessary, however, to approach much more critically our work in this field, and to demand from ourselves a much higher standard. We must cut loose from stereotyped formula, and from the use of slogans as a substitute for thinking. We need now, above all, detailed and concrete work, with the emphasis laid upon accuracy and fundamental understanding of the continuous historical process that connects the past history of our country with its present and future problems.

The purpose of the present brief article is, from the above approach, to discuss the value and the limitations of the popular slogan: "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism."

* * *

It is unquestionable that this slogan has played a positive role and served to dissolve the remnants of the old sectarian and nihilistic approach to American national traditions which we inherited from the pre-war Social-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist Party, and which the Socialists had taken over uncritically from the mechanical debunking school of historical study founded by Charles Beard. The school of Beard, which stood alone in the first decades of this century as the only trend seriously interested in historical research, necessarily produced about the only work of any value; but its meritorious desire to dig beneath the sonorous rhetoric of conventional history to the underlying realities was gradually transformed into the fixed idea that historical analysis consists in reducing the rich pattern and colors of social development to a uniform gray monotone of human greed, unprincipledness, and lust for power, an undifferentiated mass of depravity from which the intelligent student finally turned in revulsion to an all-embracing skepticism or nihilism. No progress at all was possible until we broke out of this blind alley into which Beard had led progressive study of history in the United States.

It was in the first stages of our offensive against Beardism, and against openly reactionary Red-baiting, that there arose (one might almost say spontaneously) the slogan: "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism."

In the early summer of 1935, I wrote for the *New Masses* an article entitled "Who Are the Americans?", as one of a series later incorporated as the first chapter in the book *What Is Communism*. Answering the Red-baiters' challenge: "Why don't you go back where you came from?" and making a head-on assault against the cynical and skeptical attitude toward Americanism, I made the declaration: "We Are the Americans, and Communism Is the Americanism of the Twentieth Century."

Without realizing it at the time, I had coined a slogan which was taken up and made a symbol of the whole struggle for a new evaluation of American history. At the Ninth Convention of the Communist Party, in 1936, the artists of the studio of the well-known Sequeiros presented a great painting, embodying the slogan. From that day it was famous, and recently reached the dizzy heights of reproduction in the columns of the *Saturday Evening Post*.

The Party has never written this slogan into any of its resolutions, however, although the struggle which it symbolized has been firmly established as a fundamental part of our program, written into the very Constitution of the Party. And the reason why this particular slogan did not find a place in a basic document must now become a matter of critical examination, since the time has come when such a discussion no longer carries any danger of confusing the main battle which has already been carried to its first and basic victory.

* * *

We did not write the slogan into our resolutions and Constitution, because it is scientifically inexact. The basic thought, that the Communists are the inheritors of American revolutionary traditions, and that Communism will, in the twentieth century, realize in a more perfect form these traditions—this is not fully and accurately expressed in the formulation I first gave it in the heat of polemics, nor in its variation by our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excellent artists. And like all inexactness or inaccuracy, it must be subjected to criticism if we are to guard against all possible misunderstandings and even harmful theoretical conclusions.

What are the possible wrong theories that might conceivably be drawn, by uncritical and unschooled theorizers—or by not-so-innocent alien influences?

Taking literally and uncritically the formulation—"Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism"—and applying the rules of formal logic, the theory could be drawn from it that Communism is a peculiar product of American development, which would reach the rest of the world by exportation. Such a narrow nationalist trend of thought may conceivably spring from the uncritical repetition of our slogan. The danger must therefore be pointed out and guarded against.

In this question is involved the basic problem of the relation between communism (or socialism), which is international and worldwide, and nationality, which is specific and concrete to one part of the world. Here we should recall Stalin's famous definition of the new society as it arises concretely—"national in form, socialist in content." The new society is the expression of principles universally valid, but its form is determined by the character of the nation in which it arises, by all the forces that have contributed to produce that nation in its specific and concrete peculiarities—in short, by its history and traditions.

Thus, the critical re-examination of our slogan leads us to the study of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, of dialectical and historical materialism. It is the concrete application of these principles which led us to the rediscovery of the American revolutionary traditions, and to our general revaluation of American history. Our study of American history is, in turn, vitalizing and deepening our grasp of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Where in the past we depended almost entirely upon the theoretical works which concretized these principles in the history of European countries, we are now facing the creative task of tracing out the working of these principles in our own national history.

It was Lenin himself who wrote the words which led us finally to face the problem. In his famous *Letter to American Workers,* Lenin reminded us of the rich revolutionary traditions of our country, and advised us to claim the heritage of 1776 and 1861. The recent publication of the correspondence and writings of Marx and Engels on the American Civil War furnished invaluable material. Stalin's history-making works on the national question furnished us with the modern instruments of thought, hammered out in the course of actually changing world history, which armed us for the task. Dimitroff gave, on many occasions, a deep stimulus and help in boldly marching forward to attack the problem.

We have entered fully into the struggle for the mastery of our country's history; we have established this as a task that involves the masses, the whole life of the nation. We have drawn wide circles into the process. The preliminary lines are drawn and the question has been correctly posed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in its essential features. Now we must pass over in the most serious manner to working out concretely the task in a deep, thorough, and critical fashion.

This is a creative task of the greatest consequence and magnitude. It requires sustained and painstaking thought, much hard work. It requires discussion and criticism. The repetition of slogans, without the constant deepening of understanding, may become an obstacle instead of a help.

We have noticed this especially with regard to the slogan, "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism," because the slogan itself is scientifically inexact. But the warning holds good for even the most precise and scientifically-accurate slogans. Formula and battlecries are necessary, but their repetition does not and cannot replace the basic function of thought and understanding.

* * *

There is another danger in the particular slogan under discussion which may be pointed out. We are Americans, American Communists, but do we claim that we are the *only Americans,* that we have staked out a monopoly claim on Americanism? Of course not, we would only be ridiculous with such a claim. The concept of "Good Americans," in the sense of the national democratic and revolutionary traditions, embraces the whole progressive majority of the people, and, further, extends to a degree among the conservative masses insofar as they show capacities of resistance to the modern forces of reaction. We Communists, taking our place as an integral sector of the progressive and democratic camp, claim the common title of "Good Americans," and further add to it the claim that our particular principles and program embody the *future* development of our country. Thus our claim is, first, one of unity with the masses of the people, and with their historical development, and, secondly, the claim to be in the vanguard—a claim which we must continuously prove by our work.

* * *

There is another angle to the question of nationality and its relation to internationalism, which more and more comes to the front. That is the question: what are "national interests," and do Communists and progressives properly identify themselves with support of such national interests. Some confusion arises in certain circles, due to the fact that imperialist policies are advanced for mass support under the claim that they represent "national interests." Therefore, some people draw the conclusion that support of national interests means support of imperialism, so long as monopoly capital controls the economy of the country.

This identification of the interests of monopoly capital with the interests of the nation is, of course, entirely false. It is false, whether it is made by the spokesmen of monopoly capital to mislead the people, or whether it is made by ostensible anti-imperialists supposedly for the purpose of fighting imperialism. In either case the false identification of imperialism with national interests comes to the same end —to confuse the people, the masses, and assist monopoly capital in maintaining its dominion over their minds.

The Manifesto of the Communist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the October Revolution contains the following most significant words on this problem:

"The nation is not the gang of fascists, reactionary financiers and industrial magnates who rob and betray the people.

"The nation is the many millions of workers, farmers and working people generally—the people who are devoted to their country, who cherish their liberty and defend their independence. Just as in Spain and China where the people are fighting with arms in hand, and in Austria and Czechoslovakia—so also in all countries menaced with fascist invasion from outside, only the working class can rally, rouse and lead the people to a victorious struggle for national liberation. The working class is the backbone of the nation, the bulwark of its liberty, dignity and independence."

We are currently being presented with the most dramatic exposition of the sharp cleavage between imperialist and national interests, on the part of Great Britain and France. The governments of both countries are pursuing policies most obviously in contradiction to the national interest, policies which even threaten the annihilation or at least the deep degradation of the nations involved; but these anti-national policies are imposed upon the people by monopoly capital, by the imperialistic ruling class, the "best families," the economic royalists—those from whose mouths the phrase "national interests" rolled most unctuously in the past. We see the beginnings of the same phenomenon in the United States, where spokesmen of the most hard-boiled imperialist interests have become the champions of surrender of America's traditional policies of the "Open Door" in the Fast East and the "Monroe Doctrine' 'in the Americas.

Both the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door originated in the resistance of American democracy to the monopolistic and aggresive policies of the older imperialist powers; during the twentieth century they were taken over and transformed into instruments of a matured American imperialism; in the present world situation we witness their transformation again, a process doing on under our eyes, into instruments of democratic defense against the aggressions of world fascism. In this process we have a classical example of the dialectical transformation of thesis into antithesis, and of the unity of opposites. Monopoly capital and the democratic forces are on opposite sides, in struggle against one another, throughout the process, but their position in relation to specific issues and policies change; these policies may be likened to fortifications, which at one time are occupied and defended by one army, at another time by the enemy.

So also the relation between national interest and capitalism is not a fixed one, given for all time and unchanging. On the broadest historical stage, capitalism first appears as the agency of all the progressive forces of society, and only gradually becomes transformed into its opposite, monopoly capital or imperialism, which threatens the destruction of society and of national interests. In the process of this transformation, as progressive capitalism grew over into the present decaying imperialism (which culminates in fascism), there is for a period an overlapping of national and capitalist interests simultaneously with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sharpening of the contradictions between them—an example of the dialectical formula of the unity and struggle of opposites. And even in the present stage of decadent capitalism, when the interests of the broadest masses of the population (national interests) urgently demand the drastic curbing of the power of monopoly capital as the precondition for continued existence—even now, the broadest popular or national interest requires, not simply the "destruction of capitalism" but the organization of the democratic majority as the precondition for future progress to a higher stage. And a capitalist democracy threatened by fascist aggression, to the degree that it can be organized to resist fascism is to that degree representing the true national interest (including even capitalist interests which can express themselves independently of monopoly capital), which is the interest of the population of that country as a whole.

Casting our eyes over the rich panorama of American history we can reach a much deeper understanding of all its stages, when we learn to trace the ebb and flow of class forces, and their combination into the two opposing camps of the reactionary and the democratic or progressive; then the meaning of the slogans and battle-cries under which the struggle is conducted becomes more clear, and we begin to understand that which baffles the idealistic historians of all schools, the shift of personalities, parties, and classes, from the most energetic support to its opposite of the most stubborn opposition to concrete issues, policies and social institutions.

Along this path we not only gain a deeper understanding of our past. We begin to acquire more and more the ability to look into our own future. And most important of all, we begin to obtain a grasp of the links which connect past history with future history; we find those answers to the problems of the day, which combine the most realistic and concrete approach to immediate questions, the solution of which leads by the quickest and least difficult path to the future, to the solution of the largest social questions, to the establishment of socialism and eventual communism.

This brief discussion, which has thus led into a consideration of some of the deepest problems of history and philosophy, opened with a critical examination of the values and limitations of a particular slogan: "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism." It is not the purpose of these critical remarks to end with the abrupt dismissal of the slogan. On the contrary, our purpose is only to put it into its proper place and perspective. We have made even its deficiencies serve a useful purpose in opening a discussion which is really one of the peliminary steps to take up one of the great tasks of the coming year of 1939. Next year is the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the United States. We have decided, at our last meeting of the National Committee and the Tenth Convention, to make this anniversary the occasion for a great campaign for study of the history of our movement and Party. Soon we hope to have available for this purpose the English translation of the new *Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union, which is destined to become an indispensable textbook in the mastery of Bolshevism, and more, one of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

While the whole world enters into the period of its deepest crisis, the Communist Parties, consolidating their positions as parties of the working class, cementing their ties with the broadest masses and their most immediate problems, are taking up the task of arming themselves with the complete arsenal provided in the teachings of the greatest leaders of human thought and action, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. That task is the mastery of history, past, present, and future.

"America's most bitter heritage is its Negro problem. Perhaps no other question has aroused such hatreds, such slanders, such suffering in our country. For more than three centuries, ever since 1619, when the first slave ship touched our shores, the presence of this darker race in America has constituted an unsolved problem, reflected, on the one hand, in the bestial cruelty of lynching and, on the other, in the noble sacrifice of a John Brown. One of the major wars in American history was lit by the fire of this conflict; and the failure of the Civil War to free the Negro people economically and socially has brought the problem down to our own day in very nearly as aggravating a form as it presented in 1861."

James W. Ford, *The Negro and the Democratic Front*, p. 19.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PANACEA MASS MOVEMENTS

A PROBLEM IN BUILDING THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[*In the first article, printed in the November issue, Comrade Foster developed an analysis of the Technocracy, Epic, Utopian, Townsend, Huey Long, and Coughlin panacea movements. He gave a short history of these movements: their rise, spread and decline; together with an analysis of their programs, their social composition, and the relation they bore to other mass movements and to the fascist danger. The following article applies these lessons to the struggle of today.*—The Editors.]

PART II

THE PRESENT SITUATION

As we have seen, the heyday of technocracy. Epic, utopian, share-the-weath and similar panacea mass movements was during the crisis period, 1932-36. After the latter year they receded as a general phenomenon; but it would be a grave blunder to conclude therefrom that they and the fascist danger that is linked with them have definitely died out. On the contrary, the objective and subjective conditions for their growth still exist in most pronounced form, and we may expect to face their reappearance in new and still more dangerous forms.

First, because big capital, increasingly fascist-minded, has more and more recourse to demagogy in order to hold the masses under its exploitation, and therefore, may be depended upon to leave no stone unturned to do all possible to initiate organizations operating by reactionary demagogy and to seize control of such movements when they spring up spontaneously.

Secondly, the prolongation of the industrial crisis, by continuing the grievances of the masses, makes them susceptible to demagogy. There are 12,000,000 unemployed; great masses of workers and farmers are living in abject poverty, and the city middle class is also being impoverished; the menace of fascism and war hangs over the country. The Roosevelt administration and the trade unions have brought considerable relief to the oppressed masses; but this is quite inadequate. The people's grievances, in the increasing breakdown of capitalism, are many and urgent. This makes the masses prone to believe the panaceas of demagogues of every stripe, which are stimulated and urged on by reactionary finance capital. And as Dimitroff stated at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, the demagogy of these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reactionaries "in its stupidity frequently reached the point of lunacy."

Thirdly, the masses are further subject to demagogic infection because the great bulk of them still remain unorganized—politically, industrially and culturally. The growth of the New Deal forces of the trade unions, of the youth movement, and of other constructive democratic organizations during the past several years has done much to unite, educate and discipline the masses and thus to immunize them against fascist demagogy; but vast numbers of them are still unorganized and therefore partially or wholly exposed. And let us not forget that, even in a country that had such big trade unions and workers' political parties as Germany, the fascist demagogues still found many millions of impoverished people to dupe.

Fourthly, the danger of demagogic mass contagion is also great because of the fact that there are already at hand many reactionary, boss-financed organizations, whose meat and drink are demagogy and who are eager to seize upon every mass illusion for their own purposes. Of these there are the more definitely fascist organizations—the Silver Shirts, Black Legion, Ku-Klux Klan, Khaki Shirts, Vigilantes, Crusaders, German-American Bund, and many others. There is also the LaFollette National Progressives of America with its semi-swastika emblem and raw, demagogic appeal—a grouping that is a potential danger to progress in the 1940 elections.

There are in addition the remnants of the many panacea mass movements which form the subject of this article and which are all striving militantly to grow. The vitality of this third type of movement is evidenced by the recent recrudescence of the Townsend movement in many states, and especially by the meteoric rise of the $30-every-Thursday Old-Age Pension Plan movement in California and other states. The latter movement is a classic specimen of its type, with a burning popular issue and honest mass support, petty-bourgeois leadership, impractical program, ultra-rapid growth, lack of trade union support, etc.

It was nevertheless strong enough to induce almost one-third of all the registered voters of California to sign a petition to put its pension plan on the ballot for the November elections. Finally and most sinister of all these forces is the Republican Party. This party, the party of big capital, has definitely embarked upon a policy of rank demagogy, which we Communists have summed up as an attempt to cover its reactionary face with a progressive mask. In the recent election campaign, Hitler-like, it promised everything to everybody, and its standard bearers did not hesitate to endorse the Townsend Plan or any panacea movement if they thought it would catch votes and help them to office. They promised the most contradictory things: higher profits for the businessmen and lower living costs for the workers, greater crops and higher prices for the farmers, more government expenditures, lower taxes and a balanced federal budget, etc.

THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

All these facts—the presence of burning grievances among the toilers, their unorganized and politically uneducated condition, and the existence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of many sprouting fascist or near-fascist organizations show the possibilities for the growth of such types of confused mass movements as Epic, Technocracy, Share-the-Wealth, and Townsend. They constitute a real problem. There will be more of them and whether they (the new California Pension Plan, for example) develop into instruments of reaction or become constructive sections in the growing democratic front will depend basically upon the policies of the progressive forces.

The democratic front is the effective answer to the danger from demagogic mass movements, whether of the Share-the-Wealth-Townsend-Technocracy type, the Progressive and Republican Party varieties, or those of more openly fascist character. The building up of the mass organizations of the workers, farmers and lower petty bourgeoisie, and their linkage on the basis of a practical program of demands in a militant alliance against the forces of reaction is the only guarantee against the menace of demagogy. The democratic front not alone mobilizes the masses for struggle against fascism, incipient and full-blown, but also, in the measure that it is built up and functions effectively and that the proletariat exercises hegemony in it, immunizes them against the many forms of capitalist demagogy. The Longs, Coughlins, Hearsts, MacFaddens, Townsends & Co. will shout in vain at masses that are organized in or under the influence of a strong democratic front.

SOME CONCRETE TASKS

In building the democratic front, especially with regard to combatting demagogy, there are a maze of tasks to be carried out. In this article I shall indicate only a few of key importance.

a. *Express the national traditions and aspirations of the people:* Every fascist and semi-fascist demagogue, to carry out his reactionary purposes, seeks to pose as the spokesman of the people's traditions and hopes; aims to wrap himself about with a mantle of ultra-patriotism. How disastrous it is when such people capture the national catchwords is all too clearly illustrated by Hitler and Mussolini. The Communist Party is acutely alive to this danger and is identifying itself completely with the true Americanism of the people. The growing democratic front must also become more conscious of this necessary work. Far more than at present, the democratic front, in all its varied manifestations, must come forward militantly as the inheritor and continuer of the people's democratic struggles. Roosevelt does this to a considerable extent with the New Deal, and the whole democratic front movement must do it more and more. It must more effectively link up its structure, campaigns, programs and perspectives with the historic mass movements and aspirations of the workers, farmers and petty bourgeoisie, dating back to the colonization of this country, and even earlier. It must proceed militantly on the basis that the democratic front is the Americanism of today, and represents all that is healthy and progressive in American history and present-day life. This identification of the democratic front with the people's Americanism will raise strong ideolog-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ical barriers in the way of capitalist demagogy of every kind.

b. *Satisfy the burning demands of the masses:* If the democratic front is to prove an effective dike against fascist and incipient fascist demagogy it must also be able to meet the urgent needs of the workers, farmers, professionals, etc., more effectively than the New Deal has done up to date. It is true that the Roosevelt administration has brought the masses many concessions, including considerable unemployment relief and work, a measure of farm relief, the legal right of trade union organization, the elements of a program of social security, the beginnings of minimum wages and bonus, some guarantees of civil rights, a little protection for small home-owners and bank depositors, etc.

But all this is only a start. The people, as we have seen, are still harassed by the most serious hardships, and until these are lessened the masses will be exposed to fascist and semi-fascist demagogy. As the Communist Party constantly points out, the masses urgently need "Jobs, Security, Democracy and Peace." The Party advocates a whole series of practical measures to accomplish this end. These include the smashing of the monopoly high price rings, the initiation of a five-billion-dollar housing program, the rehabilitation and nationalization of the railroads, a great increase in W.P.A., and direct relief, more protection for the farmers, the launching of a great national health program, the nationalization of the banks and munition plants, the development of a big program to protect the youth, extension of the rights of the Negroes, insistence upon an embargo against Germany and Japan, full support of the invaded Chinese, Spanish, Ethiopian, Austrian and Czechoslovakian peoples, and the development of a policy of concerted peace action by the democratic peoples of the world to restrain the fascist aggressors, etc., etc.

For the adoption of these measures, the only sure guarantee against the growth of fascist demagogy, the main task is not to bring pressure to bear against Roosevelt (although that is necessary also), but solidly to organize all the divisions of the democratic front—workers, farmers, middle class —and to direct their irresistible power—political, industrial, cultural—against the big reactionary capitalist forces that are preventing the realization of even Roosevelt's modest program of reform and that constitute the breeding nest of the fascist danger in all its forms, not the least of which is the confused mass movements that are our theme.

c. *Clarify the Farmer-Labor Party question:* An important task in connection with directing the masses in such movements as the Epic, Share-the-Wealth, Townsend, California Pension Plan, etc., into constructive democratic front channels is to clarify the question of the third party. Often the panacea movements set up independent tickets and parties in an arbitrary way that seriously splits the growing solidarity of the toilers and plays directly into the hands of reaction. The demagogues make wide use of the third party slogan. The most striking example of this was the Lemke presidential candidacy in 1936, set up by the Coughlin, Long and Townsend movements. Nationally, there now exists the LaFollette Pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressive Party, and in California there are two such movements, both very dangerous, the Townsend Party and the Progressive Party. And we may look for further similar developments in the future in various states.

Such third party movements acquire great force from the facts that the masses are in growing revolt against reactionary leadership in the two old parties and that for many years Communists, Socialists and progressives have been militantly urging the formation of a separate Farmer-Labor Party. Demagogues of the Coughlin, Townsend, Lemke type take advantage of this situation and set up their splitting third parties. Now the mass desire to build a great party of workers, farmers and lower middle class elements is a sound one; but it is a task that has to be gone at with skill and intelligence. Experience has taught us that the offhand launching of third party movements, even when it is done with the best of intentions, can be highly destructive to the solidarity of the masses and their chances for victory.

The building of the broad party of toilers that we, in tune with the most advanced elements of the workers, are aiming at, is following two broad, converging lines of development. First and most important at this time is the growth of the progressive wing within the Democratic Party (and to a lesser extent also in the Republican Party). Whether this movement will eventually lead to the transformation of the Democratic Party (or most of it) into a liberal party, into an approximation of a Farmer-Labor Party with or without that name, or whether it will culminate in a great split and the formation of a new party is problematical and not a question of immediate concern. The second path to the realization of the eventual mass party of toilers is through such organizations as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party, the Wisconsin Progressive Party, the American Labor Party of New York, Labor's Non-Partisan League, etc., which follow varying degrees of independent activity and organization.

Unity of action of all the toilers in one broad democratic front, here and now, is the very essence of our strategy against the forces of reaction; hence it is of basic importance that both the foregoing streams making towards the eventual formation of a great party of the masses be dovetailed together and developed as two closely related phases of one general process. Consequently, when new parties are established or independent candidacies launched such action must be undertaken always with careful regard to its effect upon the struggle of the New Deal progressives inside the Democratic Party. Otherwise the mass forces will be split and disaster can result. The question, therefore, is not one of giving up the Farmer-Labor Party slogan, but of teaching the masses the course of strategy by which this historically correct slogan must be realized. It would be a grave error to surrender the Farmer-Labor Party slogan to the demagogues—the Lovestoneites, Trotskyites, Coughlinites, Townsendites, LaFollettes, etc., who are so eager to misuse it.

d. *Establish cooperative relations with the panacea mass movements:* A further vital consideration in incorporating such movements as Epic,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Pension Plan, Share-the-Wealth, etc., into the nascent democratic front is to set up friendly working relations with the masses in these movements, to participate thoroughly in them. We must never forget that these masses have legitimate grievances and are fighting to satisfy them —even though in many cases their leaders are corrupt and fascist-minded demagogues. We must learn to work with such masses even while fighting their reactionary leaders. We must also understand how, while explaining the fallacies of their often fantastic panaceas, to show the masses that the democratic front and its realistic program offer the most practical means to accomplish the end they have in mind, and to convince them that any connection with reactionary candidates and parties is disastrous. Already our Party has had considerable success in this general direction, not the least of which is our present-day good working relations with the California Pension Plan movement.

e. *Develop the perspective of the masses:* Traditionally the perspective of the huge bulk of the toiling masses in this country has not transcended the capitalist orbit. That is, they have hoped and planned to solve their urgent daily economic problems—to secure jobs, to raise their living standards, to educate their children, to provide for the inevitable "rainy days," etc.—within the framework of the capitalist system. They have had no socialist perspective, but have been basically influenced in developing their general social outlook by capitalist illusions.

Such illusions among the masses, fostered by various misleaders, reached their apex during the Coolidge "prosperity" period. The mass perspective at that time foresaw very positively a rapid growth of the toilers' well-being under capitalism. But the great 1929 crisis, with its terrific industrial breakdown, wholesale unemployment, widespread starvation, and general decline in living standards, gave this rosy dream a rude shock. Huge numbers had their faith in the capitalist system confused and weakened, and this showed itself, as we have seen, by the growth of broad demands for a "new social order," for a society based on "production for use," much vague talk about a coming "revolution," and by the springing up of many panaceas whose implications would require profound modifications of the capitalist system. The New Deal, with its program of reform, has partially restored the masses' faith in their ability to defend themselves even under the capitalist system; but its inability to overcome the industrial crisis and the prevalent consequent widespread mass pauperization has not eliminated the aspirations, though still confused, from the minds of huge numbers of people that somehow or other the capitalist system will have to be basically modified or even abolished before they can achieve the well-being they so ardently desire.

Needless to emphasize, this confusion in the mass ideology, unless corrected, presents a big opening for fascist and semi-fascist demagogues of all stripes to give the people harmful and reactionary outlooks and programs. Let us not forget that Hitler and Mussolini rode into power exploiting vague revolutionary sentiments among

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the backward masses, and also that the Coughlins and Longs showed themselves expert in utilizing such confused mass sentiments in this country. Thus, the clarifying and strengthening of the mass perspective becomes of major importance for the present-day success of the democratic front and also ultimately for our program of socialism.

The first steps in this task are to teach the masses, by effective mass struggle as well as by the spoken and written word, the possibilities possessed by the people, united in a great democratic front, to alleviate many of their current burning mass grievances even within the framework of the decaying capitalist system. This does not mean re-awakening capitalist illusions among them, but teaching them their own power under present-day circumstances. A democratic front government in the United States, supported by powerful trade unions, farm organizations, and strong political and cultural organizations, can, through militant struggle, weaken the main forces of the enemy, finance capital, in many of its key positions by securing immediate control of the government apparatus and the armed forces, by taking active steps to break the sit-down strike of big capital and to expand production, by nationalizing various trustified industries such as banking, railroad and munitions, by cracking down upon monopolistic practices, etc. A democratic front government can substantially protect the living standards of the workers, farmers and professonals, shield their civil rights against resurgent reaction and fascism, provide a broad system of social insurance, and, in cooperation with other democratic peoples, help stave off war. It can set up a new and freer form of democracy than capitalism has ever known and thus create more favorable conditions for the people's advance to socialism.

But, while building the confidence of the masses in the power of the democratic front to protect their interests within the framework of capitalism, we must at the same time guard them against capitalist illusions. We must insistently teach them that the present social order is incurably in decay and that only by the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of socialism can the people basically solve the great social problems of hunger, insecurity, industrial crises, fascism and war that confront them; that only through socialism can they open the way to an expanding prosperity, freedom, culture and peace. In all this educational work the popularization of the socialist achievements of the U.S.S.R. is of fundamental importance.

To cultivate a mass socialist perspective is doubly urgent at the present time, because the toilers in this country, as in the rest of the capitalist world, are confused by the kaleidoscopic course of events. Their old-time perspectives are breaking down with the collapse of the capitalist system and they are preyed upon by all stripes of confusionist, fascist and Trotskyite demagogues, who offer them reactionary utopias and panaceas. It therefore becomes of prime necessity that the broadest possible masses be taught the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist analysis of world events and their ultimate socialist solution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In dealing with the problem of such panacea mass movements as Technocracy, Epic, Townsend, Share-the-Wealth, Utopians, California Pension Plan, etc., as well as demagogic movements of openly reactionary or fascist character, an especially heavy responsibility falls upon the Communist Party. The task of winning the masses in such movements for constructive struggle is a central one in building the democratic front. And its successful accomplishment calls for the exercise of every one of our Party's qualities as the vanguard of the working class.

Our Party has need to exert all its Marxian training to analyze and skilfully explain to the masses the theoretical complexities of the otherwise bewildering situation that is arising with the decay of capitalism; it must teach the masses to wrest the national slogans from the hands of reactionary demagogues; it must valiantly struggle to achieve the unsatisfied immediate demands of the masses for jobs, security, democracy and peace and prevent their being exploited by demagogues; it must know how successfully to combine the fight for the Farmer-Labor Party with present-day necessities in building the democratic front; it must understand the way to cooperate with panacea mass movements while pointing out their fallacies and combatting their often unreliable leaders; it must know how to show the masses the extent to which they can defend their interests under capitalism while at the same time educating them to the inevitable necessity for socialism; it must be able to protect the revolutionary slogans from misuse by Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and spurious, "Left" Socialists.

All of which big tasks emphasize afresh the necessity for building our Party. As never before, we must push on with the recruitment of its forces by the inclusion of the large numbers of workers—fighters who are literally standing at its doors. And especially must we pay urgent attention to the Bolshevik training of our members and contacts. In these days, with complex problems and desperate struggles growing everywhere, with fascist demagogy sprouting rankly on all sides, with fascist capitalism franticaly striving to crush out all democracy and socialism, the question of speedily developing a great body of clear-thinking Communist thinkers and fighters becomes of decisive importance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION AND TASKS FOR ACHIEVING UNITY

BY ROY HUDSON

WHAT is the perspective in the struggle for trade union unity? What are the tasks that lie before the labor movement that will make possible the establishment of trade union unity, that will strengthen the forces of democracy and progress, and guarantee the defeat of reaction?

These are questions that labor and the forces of progress and democracy are asking anew, as a result of the recent convention of the A. F. of L. and in view of the coming convention of the C.I.O.

THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION

The Fifty-eighth Convention of the A. F. of L. was an arena of struggle between two opposing forces. On the one hand, there were those forces mainly responsible for the split in the labor movement and who are now openly supporting the policies of the Liberty League and the economic royalists of the country. Opposing them were the staunch supporters of the New Deal and its progressive labor program, who recognize the need to defeat the attacks of the reactionaries. They are beginning to realize that a united labor movement is essential if the gains registered by labor on the economic and legislative fields during the era of the New Deal are to be maintained and if the growing offensive of reaction is to be stopped.

The convention dramatized the extent to which the forces of the country are tending to line up into two camps, the camp of reaction and the camp of progress and democracy. It dramatized also the role played by labor in uniting the forces of the democratic front. Time and again it reflected in one form or another the struggle of labor and the common people against reaction and the menace of fascism and war. This was especially true as regards President Roosevelt's message to the convention and in the speeches of Daniel Tobin, President of the Teamsters Union.

There was no spirit of paternalism in Roosevelt's message to the convention. The fact that the President took the initiative in raising the need for a united labor movement not only greatly strengthened the movement for unity, but also reflected the degree to which the New Deal bases itself upon the support of the common people and labor; it showed how deeply the New Deal is concerned about the offensive of reaction, and how vital labor unity is if the farmers, middle classes and professional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people are to be united in the struggle against fascism. President Tobin showed that he clearly understood this when he expressed the opinion that between the lines of his message, President Roosevelt had said in effect (and we quote Tobin's interpretation):

"If you expect us to go on in the future we must have a solid labor movement behind us, not only to sustain what we have already done but to encourage us and to back us up in securing more legislation on behalf of the workers."

TOBIN TAKES A STRONG STAND FOR UNITY

Expressing the sentiments of the great mass of A. F. of L. workers and basing himself on the experiences of the American labor movement and the lessons of the victory of fascism in Germany, Tobin clearly stated the need for a united labor movement to defeat reaction:

"There is the danger of adverse legislation, there is the danger of reactionaries getting into power politically.

"Labor needs not only to consolidate its gains from a legislative standpoint, but it needs to increase those gains. Witness the attempt to destroy the labor movement now in the states of Oregon and California. President Green knows what it is and if they are successful in these states, and I am afraid they will be because of the division of labor, other states will follow and labor will be put in a straitjacket."

After referring to the victory of fascism in Germany, Tobin said:

"Why do I mention it? Because you could not tell the German leaders, as it is impossible to tell ours, that unless you stop and join hands together and fight shoulder to shoulder, there is a danger first of destroying you by legislation, and next of destroying you by some governmental authority created from the top down.

"History, if it is no other use to us, ought to be a guiding light to steer us onward toward doing that which we believe ought to be done. If we are in doubt let us watch the history of the labor movement in other countries. Then have we any right to say that it can't happen here? We certainly have not."

But Tobin went far beyond a recognition of the danger of reaction and the need to unite for its defeat. He envisaged the potential strength of the labor movement and the role it can play in the affairs of the nation:

"In this country at the present time there are close to 7,000,000 men and women organized, the highest number of organized employees with signed contracts now obtaining in these United States that ever obtained in the history of the labor movement. It is by far the greatest membership of any trade union movement in the world.* To the 7,000,000 we have already organized, we could easily add two and a half million more, and in one organization, working solidly together, if we had ten million organized workers in this country, which we could easily have in two years, then we could add ten or fifteen million more of their friends and families, and that is conservative, then we could tell any administration, whether Republican or Democrat, what the American workers are entitled to, and what they should have. That is the key to the whole situation, this division in the ranks of labor."

From the position set forth in these statements, it is clear that Tobin, and all those who in one form or another supported him in challenging the policies of Frey, Woll and Company, did so from the point of view of the fundamental problem of the struggle against growing reaction, which

* Excluding, of course, the Soviet Union, which has a trade union movement of 22,000,000—*R. H.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found expression in the convention around the question: Should the A. F. of L. support or oppose the New Deal? This was the main issue before the Fifty-eighth Convention—the issue around which the main differences of opinion developed and which determined the position of the various forces on labor unity and other vital questions.

Two questions raised at this convention again emphasized the reasons for the continuing split in the labor movement. First, the reactionaries directed their attacks against the Wagner Labor Act, solely from the point of view of maintaining their exclusive jurisdiction, even in those formerly unorganized mass production industries now organized by the C.I.O. Secondly, a minor, yet significant, resolution, introduced by the officers of the Building Trades Department, not only protested the issuance of an International Charter to the chemical workers now organized into federal locals, but demanded that these locals be dissolved and the workers in them split up into various craft unions.

If additional proof was needed to establish the bitter opposition of the reactionary wing of the top leaders to the principles of industrial unionism, then certainly this convention established it beyond doubt. It should now be clear to all that the position of the craft union bureaucrats on the question of industrial unionism, which led them to split the A. F. of L. and which prevented the negotiations with the C.I.O. last December from reestablishing unity, remains unaltered and has now led them into an open anti-New Deal position, into full support of the program of big business in its attacks on the New Deal and its threat to democracy and world peace.

What was the objective of the reactionaries, headed by Woll, Frey, Hutcheson and Company, and what did they actually achieve at the convention? They stood for perpetuating the split in the labor movement and demanded continuation of the war against the C.I.O. Threatening the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress with revocation of its charter, they demanded the splitting of the Canadian trade union movement with the expulsion of the C.I.O. unions.

By cleverly concealing their purposes, the reactionaries carried on their offensive against adoption of the Wagner Labor Act, the Wages-Hours Bill, the relief program of the administration—all essentially attacks against the New Deal. Not content with this sniping campaign, they even attempted to secure the adoption of a general condemnation of the New Deal program, as the first step towards an open break with the New Deal. On the all-important question of peace, the Executive Council urged a step backward toward isolationism.

MOUNTING OPPOSITION TO THE REACTIONARY LEADERSHIP

The outstanding feature of the convention was the powerful struggle conducted against the reactionaries and the tremendous growth registered by the progressive forces in the A. F. of L. Although inadequately, the convention reflected the opposition of the A. F. of L. membership to the policies of the majority of the Executive Council on the question of the New Deal and labor unity. This opposi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, already expressed in many local, city, state and international bodies of the A. F. of L., is to a great extent responsible for the sharp differences of opinion that developed in the convention. A number of progressive decisions were adopted, and the New Deal and progressive forces registered a number of important additional gains. Let us discuss these questions point by point.

1. The reactionaries in the Executive Council suffered a major defeat in their efforts to put across a general condemnation of the New Deal program, their main objective in the convention. This condemnation, even though thinly veiled, sounded like a manifesto from the Liberty League and was brought before the convention as a special report of the Resolutions Committee, headed by John P. Frey and Matthew Woll. Inasmuch as this Resolutions Committee establishes the pro-Liberty League tendencies of the majority of the Executive Council, it is well worth quoting:

"The tendency of today is for the state to take over more and more functions which we believe belong to labor itself in and through its organizations. Already the state is seizing control of our destiny through a National Labor Relations Board. We must say that it should be clear to every American that the philosophy which is being developed in action by which an ever-increasing domain is being given to the state, is expressive of the philosophy and practice of socialism. . . .

"We believe that business has learned the folly of its earlier ways, that it has largely come to realize that labor has the right to function as a collectivity just as business has a right to function in that way. We believe business largely has come to realize that no single group has a right to exploit the wealth and the people of our country by reason of possession or economic power. We believe the principle of collective bargaining has come into general recognition."

This manifesto was greeted with a storm of opposition led by conservative craft union leaders from the Pattern Makers, the Boiler Makers and Letter Carriers. Even President Green had to object to the report because it was, "to say the least, a bit confused." This opposition was a clear indication to the anti-New Dealers that they had overshot their mark. Confronted with certain defeat if the question came to a vote, Frey and Woll beat a retreat and agreed to refer the report to the Executive Council. In their long years of control these reactionaries have seldom, if ever, suffered a similar defeat in conventions of the A. F. of L.

2. The widespread sentiment of the A. F. of L. membership for militant policies, especially in resistance to wage cuts at this time—pressure which has forced the top leaders of the A. F. of L. to abandon their traditional "no-strike" policy—found expression in the decision of the convention pledging full support to the railroad workers in their efforts to defeat wage cuts and placing the A. F. of L. on record to support strike action on the railroads if that became necessary.

3. Not only were the progressive forces throughout the country encouraged and strengthened in their fight for a united labor movement by the stand taken by Tobin, but a further important point was gained as a result of this struggle. This is clear when we consider that the position of the Executive Council was essentially this:

"Our task now is to build the A. F. of L., while the incubus of autocracy destroys the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

C.I.O. If dictatorship is actually abandoned and Communists repudiated and expelled, then the way to unity is made possible, providing the rank and file of the secession movement make known their demand for unity. *We can only recommend that we wait and watch.*"

The struggle of the labor unity forces led by Tobin forced the Executive Council to concede what it was before unwilling to state, when it did not openly oppose the "understanding" of Tobin to the effect that "the Executive Council stands instructed by this convention to open up negotiations beginning where they left off in the last session with C.I.O. representatives." Any uncertainty regarding the position of Tobin and many other progressive forces in voting for the report of the committee was further clarified in the stand taken by the delegates representing the Teachers Union. These delegates, who originally voted against accepting the report, on the next day changed their vote, declaring that they did so on the basis of the intent of Tobin's statement and in order fully to support his fight. There can be no doubt that a substantial number of delegates had this in mind in voting for the acceptance of an otherwise vicious anti-unity report.

4. The question of independent political action came before the convention in the form of a resolution from the Hotel Workers Union which placed that union on record as favoring affiliation to Labor's Non-Partisan League and urging the convention to take similar action. While the Executive Council succeeded in getting the convention to ratify the instructions it had sent out months earlier denouncing L.N.P.L., it found itself in the contradictory position of being unable to prevent repudiations of its own instructions. Regarding the resolution from the Hotel Workers Union, it recommended non-concurrence on the technical grounds that the resolution was not properly before the convention, in that it constituted policies for the Hotel Workers Unions and instructions to its officers, matters which the Resolutions Committee had to acknowledge to the convention but over which it had no jurisdiction.

In addition to this resolution, powerful speeches in support of independent political action, favoring cooperation with the C.I.O. and all other progressive forces on the political field and in defense of the American Labor Party were made by A. Philip Randolph of the Pullman Porters, Jerome Davis of the American Federation of Teachers, and a number of other speakers, all of whom gave expression to the ever-growing movement for unity of labor and other progressive forces upon the political field.

5. The decisions and debates on the Negro question were of outstanding importance. A resolution, urging that all international unions eliminate constitutional provisions barring Negroes from membership and that a committee be set up for the purpose of conducting educational activities along these lines, was not adopted in its entirety. Nevertheless, the spirit of the resolution was concurred in, with recommendations to the Executive Council for action. This constitutes a big step forward, in view of former decisions of the A. F. of L. on this matter. Another

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolution urged that the convention protest the firing of Negro maids by railroad companies in violation of the seniority principle. The Resolutions Committee, headed by Frey, attempted to distort this resolution and urged non-concurrence on the grounds that it urged a monopoly for certain jobs for Negro women. After a sharp debate from the floor, the Resolutions Committee was forced to give way.

The main resolution on the Negro question came from the Pullman Porters Union. Randolph, its spokesman, in defending this resolution, made an important contribution to the popular presentation of the problems of the Negro workers and people. Moreover, he gave a splendid example to all progressives of how to conduct a principled fight on fundamental questions that may not be thoroughly understood and in which the progressives may be in a minority.

6. A number of other gains—incidental, but important—were scored by the progressives. The speech of George Padway, counsel of the A. F. of L., intended as a highlight of the convention in the efforts of the reactionaries to smear the New Deal, was pushed completely into the background as a result of Tobin's first speech on the question of labor unity. The Red-baiting tactics of the Tories in the Executive Council were rejected when they endeavored to label the New Deal as "socialism." Also, the fact that the Executive Council had to retreat from its original position and agree to seat the Typographical delegates, in spite of the fact that their union had voted to refuse to pay the special tax with which to fight the C.I.O., was another indication of the council's weakened position.

The step backward taken by the convention on the question of peace deserves further emphasis. The policy of isolation, which in essence was advocated by the Executive Council, was criticized, particularly in the extremely important speeches of the fraternal delegates from Great Britain. Although they failed to criticize the pro-Chamberlain policy of such British trade union leaders as Sir Walter Citrine, they did make it clear that the policy of Chamberlain did not represent the sentiments of the British people and emphasized the need for international solidarity of the workers and all democratic forces to defeat the "twin menace of fascism and war."

The position of the Executive Council was further countered by the resolution from the Hotel Workers Union, which proposed endorsement of the policies outlined in President Roosevelt's Chicago speech and urged cooperation of all democratic nations to check the aggressors. In spite of these positive factors, however, the fact remains that very few resolutions were submitted to the convention from the respective trade unions and that the report of the Resolutions Committee received no real opposition from the floor, the progressive forces failing to take the initiative in bringing forward an effective peace program. This must be but a reflection of the inadequate attention given by the progressive forces, including the Communists, to the struggle for peace. This weakness can have only the most serious consequences unless

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is eliminated, in view of the ever-growing menace to world peace.

RELATION OF FORCES

What was the relation of forces in the convention? This question remained unanswered as the struggle did not reach the stage of a vote on any clear-cut issue. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the strength of the New Deal and labor unity forces proved a serious challenge to Woll, Frey and Company, and that these reactionaries had a big advantage because they were clear as to their objectives, were organized around a definite program, and conducted a consistent struggle for it. It was this, and not solely their voting strength that enabled them to take advantage of the weakness of the progressive forces.

On the other hand, the New Deal and labor unity supporters were not organized, had no clear program, did not make a consistent fight on all issues. The forces opposing the policies of Woll, Frey and Co. tended to fall into the following three categories:

1. The overwhelming majority of the convention undoubtedly supported the New Deal program; but the anti-New Deal policy of Woll, Frey and Co. became clear to this majority only when a general condemnation of the New Deal program was put forward. Only on this question, where the issues were clear, did this majority threaten to oppose the reactionary Resolutions Committee.

2. Those supporters of the New Deal and of progressive unionism who recognized that a united labor movement was the key to a stronger labor movement and the defense of the New Deal. The main representatives of these forces were the Teamsters and Hotel Workers Union.

The International Teamsters Union is now the largest union in the A. F. of L. It is the union that suffers the most in carrying out the Executive Council's war on the C.I.O. Because of the very character of the industry, the Teamsters must bear the brunt of the fighting in any such "war" over widespread localities. They, more than most other unions, feel acutely the need of cooperation with the C.I.O.

The conclusion drawn from these facts, as well as the general lessons of what division in the ranks of labor means in the light of recent experiences in America and abroad, help to explain the position taken by the Teamsters at this convention. Their representative, Tobin, not only raised the fundamental problem of labor unity with all its implications but he brought forward a program which to a great extent was embodied in his strategy. He did not attempt to force a vote on a definite program and principles that would constitute a basis for reunification. He did not even come forward with such a specific program as was contained, for instance, in the resolution of the Hotel Workers Union. He sought to conciliate certain elements by joining with them in sharply criticizing the administration of the Wagner Act, but at the same time he firmly maintained that unity was the solution. Tobin's aim was to place the issue of labor unity and the New Deal squarely, to arouse sentiment and support to strengthen his possibilities of influ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

encing future events and the course of the Executive Council, without forcing a vote on a specific program.

True, Tobin's position did not make the issues completely clear; also, in joining with those forces who denounced the Communists, he merely played into the hands of the people he was trying to defeat. But despite their limitations, his position, his strategy, and even his program, did and do serve to rally the forces of unity and the New Deal.

The Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, now the fourth largest union in the A. F. of L., played an important role in the convention. Its delegates had a mandate from the membership that was in the main progressive on such questions as labor unity, independent political action and the struggle for peace. The tremendous growth of this union in the past two years is a living refutation of the charge that the existence and growth of the C.I.O. have jeopardized the existence of the A. F. of L. unions. The Hotel Union is symbolic of the growing movement for unity and progressive unionism in the A. F. of L. At the same time there were hesitations and falterings evidenced by some of the Hotel Workers delegates at the convention in the face of the sharp attacks of the anti-labor unity forces. These weaknesses, which were overcome only by the strong, aggressive fight of Tobin, reflect the lack of clarity and the hesitations that still characterize many of the progressives in the A. F. of L. However, the hope of the reactionaries that the withdrawal of the Hotel Workers' resolution on labor unity meant support for Frey & Co. was shattered by President Flore in outlining the position of his union and throwing its full weight in support of the fight for labor unity.

3. The progressives, few in number and mainly from the smaller unions, such as the Pullman Porters and the Teachers Union, not only collaborated with Tobin and other forces on the issues of labor unity and opposed the general condemnation of the New Deal, but in speeches or resolutions actively defended the Wagner Labor Act and brought forward progressive policies on the questions of peace, independent political action, defense of the rights of the Negro people, and other important issues. The work of these forces and their contributions to the convention far exceeded their actual voting strength.

The fraternal delegate from Canada, in reporting on the decisions of the Canadian trade union movement and in defending its policy to keep both A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions united in one trade union movement, made an important contribution to the convention and undoubtedly greatly encouraged and strengthened the progressive forces.

It goes without saying that those delegates who were also members of the Communist Party joined with all other progressive forces in resisting the anti-labor unity, anti-New Deal policies of the Tories in the Executive Council. The Communists at all times endeavored to help make the issues clear, to advocate practical programs in connection with the questions confronting the labor movement, and by doing so helped unify the supporters of labor unity and the New Deal, thus making the struggle on these issues more effective. Not-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withstanding the slanders of Mr. Frey and others that the Communists desire the destruction of the A. F. of L., the Communists have consistently stood for and fought for a united progressive labor movement, and join with all other progressive forces in greeting the fact that the convention registered a stronger and more progressive A. F. of L. and that real advances were made in the fight for a united labor movement and the building of the democratic front.

THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONVENTION

The convention registered a strengthening of the forces of labor unity and the democratic front, greatly advancing the fight on these issues and creating favorable conditions for the further rapid development of the movement for unity of labor and of all forces of progress and democracy in the struggle against reaction. Will these favorable opportunities be realized? The fact that this convention expressed, though inadequately, the sentiments of the rank and file and the broad movement that already exist, embracing many local unions, city and state bodies, and some international unions—a glimpse of which was indicated in the flood of telegrams to Tobin—is the guarantee that the struggle against the anti-unity, anti-New Deal policies of Woll, Frey and Co. can and will proceed at a much more rapid tempo. The future activities of those progressive forces which took a stand in the convention will be decisive only to the extent that they determine how rapidly this movement develops and is organized along the most effective lines.

Whether or not the present favorable opportunities will be utilized will be determined by the further strengthening of the A. F. of L. progressive forces and their future activities, and by the course pursued by the C.I.O. in its daily activities and its coming national convention. The coming convention can become an important medium for, and perhaps a decisive factor in the establishment of labor unity—in uniting the forces of democracy and progress to defeat reaction. The policies consistently followed by the C.I.O. which, among others things, have been a major factor in the growth of progressive unionism and the crystallization of the New Deal and labor unity forces, are of such a character as to indicate already that this convention will not hinder but advance the struggle for unity of the working class, unity of all progressive forces.

Inasmuch as some of the so-called friends of unity, unfortunately including supporters of the C.I.O., such as Mr. Dubinsky, echoing the sentiments of President Green, question the advisability of a C.I.O. convention at this time and express the fear that the convention may hinder the fight for labor unity, perhaps we should examine some of the "new" arguments brought forward to justify their vacillations.

First, there is the so-called argument that the report of the Executive Council concerning the negotiations that took place between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. clearly established that there was no justification in terminating negotiations, and that the responsibility for their failure rests upon the C.I.O.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But nothing in the report of the Executive Council furnishes any basis for revising the conclusions previously arrived at. The report of the Executive Council cannot hide the continued opposition of the reactionaries to the principles of industrial unionism, and it was this opposition that prevented the negotiations last December from reaching a successful conclusion. They tried to hide this fact then; they tried to do it at the 58th convention. But facts cannot be ignored, and in view of the opposition to industrial unionism, continued efforts at that time to negotiate would not only have been fruitless but to have marked time until the question of each individual C.I.O. union had been negotiated with the craft union leaders—whose main claim to jurisdiction is not their effort to organize but some God-given mandate from the Executive Council—would have resulted in demobilizing the fight for trade union unity, to have weakened and disgusted the workers with fruitless negotiations.

Second, the so-called argument that the issuance of the call for the C.I.O. convention was an affront to the President's plea for peace, and was a declaration of war. Evidently these people have not yet learned that not hesitation but a demonstration of the unity and strength of the C.I.O. weakens the position of the reactionary forces in the A. F. of L. and strengthens the progressives and supporters of labor unity.

Let these gentlemen ask themselves —if the forces of reaction had been successful in their recent campaign to weaken the C.I.O. by disrupting and splitting the Auto Union, the Marine Union, and the C.I.O. forces in various states—then would the A. F. of L. convention register the gains it did? On the contrary, if the C.I.O. had been weakened, then the struggle for labor unity at the convention would have been much weaker indeed. From this, does it not follow that the issuance of the call for the C.I.O. convention, demonstrating the increased strength and unity of the C.I.O., was a timely and most effective blow against the foes of labor unity?

What is the actual present position of the C.I.O. and its perspective on labor unity? This question is fairly well indicated in the recent issues of the *C.I.O. News,* where it is stated:

> "The forthcoming convention of the C.I.O., however, so far from being an obstacle in the path of unity, is likely to be a most effective step in that direction.
>
> "For, once it is conclusively established that the C.I.O. is a firmly grounded movement with the organized power as well as the right to protect the interests of its affiliated unions, the A. F. of L. leaders will have to forget their foolish hopes of dividing and destroying the new movement.
>
> "And once they are ready to recognize established facts, and to deal sincerely and on a basis of equality with the C.I.O., they can be sure that neither the C.I.O. nor its leaders will place any obstacle in the way of that genuine labor unity which has always been their aim."

Therefore, the arguments enumerated above, instead of proving the existence of anti-unity policies on the part of the C.I.O. leadership, prove the contrary, that those who advance them do so to hide the fact that, consciously or unconsciously, their sympathies lie with the Tories in the A. F. of L. Executive Council. As for those who sincerely desire unity, they can have the greatest confidence that the con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sistent policies of the C.I.O. constitute the basis for fullest possible collaboration of all progressive forces in working out policies that will not only serve to consolidate and strengthen the C.I.O., but will serve to advance the fight for trade union unity, for unity of all democratic and progressive forces.

The fight for trade union unity will be further strengthened if the A. F. of L. membership takes steps to halt the Executive Council's plans to hamstring the Wagner Act; if strong protest is registered against the condemnation of the New Deal program by Woll and Co.; and if the widest possible support is rallied for Tobin's position as well as for the resolution of the Hotel Workers Union demanding reopening of the negotiations with the C.I.O.

The further extension of all forms of cooperation between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. on issues confronting the entire trade union movement is perhaps the most decisive step in the fight for trade union unity. The cooperation, of a varied character, between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. in the election campaign, in defending New Deal legislation and civil rights, in resisting wage cuts can be further developed at a rapid tempo, *securing unity of action down below*, and will, more than anything else, lay the basis for a reunited trade union movement.

The developments at the A. F. of L. convention emphasize the need for far more attention to the strengthening of the A. F. of L. progressive movement. In the light of the convention the situation should be reviewed in each union for the purpose of evaluating the attitude of all forces in regards to labor unity and the New Deal, seeking to bring about the collaboration of the broadest possible forces in the struggle for a united trade union movement, for unity of labor with all progressive democratic forces in the struggle against reaction.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A POWERFUL IDEOLOGICAL WEAPON OF BOLSHEVISM*

THE appearance of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* under the editorship of a commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and approved by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., is a big event in the ideological life of the Party. The Party received a real history worthy of it—a profound scientific work in the production of which the teacher of the Party, Comrade Stalin, most actively participated. The Bolshevik Party, the Soviet people, and the world proletariat received an ideological weapon of colossal theoretical power, a weapon which will further the task of the revolutionary reorganization of the world.

A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U., approved by the Central Committee of the Party, is a textbook of no ordinary type. It is the *teaching of Bolshevism* and not merely a textbook. In this remarkable book is concentrated and presented in a generalized form the entire gigantic, historic experience of the Bolshevik Party.

A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U. is here dealt with in close, logical, and historical connection with Leninism, with the theory and tactic of the proletarian revolution. Thus, there is eliminated the hitherto existing shortcoming in our propaganda—the separation between the instruction in the history of the Party and instruction in Leninism, which was the greatest shortcoming in our educational propaganda activities.

A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U. brings forth the facts of the history of the Party in a well-constructed system pursuing the unity of scientific periodization, as was proposed by Comrade Stalin in his famous letter, "On a Textbook on the History of the C.P.S.U."; the formulation of these facts is connected with the history of the U.S.S.R. and is given against the background of the general historical and political-economic conditions. As distinguished from the past, unsatisfactory textbooks on the history of the C.P.S.U., *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.,* published under the editorship of the commission of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., gives a profound, Marxist explanation of the events and facts of the history of the Bolshevik Party. To the number of scientific, theoretical achievements of the history of the C.P.S.U., approved by the Central Committee of the Party, there is in addition the fact that in this book, simultaneously with the exposition of the history of the Party and Leninism, are also given the theoretical

* Translated from *The Bolshevik,* fortnightly organ of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., No. 17-18, September 15, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bases of communism—the bases of dialectical and historical materialism.

A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U., by its size, is described as a short course. However, with regard to the depth of its exposition, to its theoretical power, this book is a *scientific history of the Party,* representing a complete, finished work on the history of the Party, Leninism, dialectical and historical materialism, indissolubly connected, as they are connected, in the practice of the revolutionary struggle of our Party.

In the classic works of Marxism-Leninism we can see the example of how brevity of exposition is combined with scientific depth. The immortal, programmatic document of Marxism, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party,* is not large in size, but in it the experience of the labor movement is brilliantly generalized, the laws of social development are revealed, the path of struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation is charted.

The classic, theoretical work of Comrade Stalin (*Foundations of Leninism*) is likewise relatively not voluminous; but it is the most masterly exposition and brilliant theoretical presentation of Leninism, the creative development of revolutionary theory, a book which arms the Bolsheviks the world over with the sharp weapon of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The greatest theoretical value of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* consists in that here, in the historical cross-section, is given the theoretical basis of the *new* contributions that the genius of Lenin added to the treasury of Marxism. This book, with Stalinist theoretical profundity and clarity, proves how consistently Lenin forged the indomitable, ideological weapon of Bolshevism; how Lenin formulated the ideological, organizational and tactical basis of the Bolshevik Party—the Party of a *new type,* in principle fundamentally distinguished from the old reformist parties of the Second International; how, in the struggles against the enemies of Marxism, Lenin defended the theoretical basis of the Marxist Party.

All this was a great historical preparation for the creation of the Bolshevik Party, the Party of a *new type,* free from opportunism and irreconcilably opposed to opportunism, a Party capable of leading the proletariat in the seizure of power, in the socialist revolution, in the building of the socialist society.

The Bolsheviks perceived that after the death of Engels the Western European Social-Democratic Parties had begun to degenerate from parties of social revolution into parties of "social reform," and that every one of these parties, as an organization, had become transformed from a leading force into an appendage of its own parliamentary group.

The Bolsheviks understood that the proletariat was in need of not such a reformist party, but another kind, a new kind of party, a real Marxist party, a party of the social revolution, a party of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The Bolsheviks wanted their party to be just such a new party," we read in the fourth chapter of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*

"And the Bolsheviks built and reared such a party. The whole history of the struggle with the 'Economists,' Mensheviks, Trotsky-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ites, Otzovists, idealists of every shade, including the empirio-criticists, was a history of the rearing of precisely such a party. The Bolsheviks wanted to create a new, Bolshevik Party, capable of serving as a model for all those who wanted to have a real revolutionary, Marxist party. The Bolsheviks were rearing such a party as early as the period of the old *Iskra*. They reared it with perseverance, persistence, in spite of all difficulties. The basic and decisive role in this preparatory work was played by such works of Lenin as *What Is To Be Done?, Two Tactics,* etc. Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* served the *ideological* preparation of such a party. Lenin's *One Step Forward—Two Steps Backward* served the *organizational* preparation of such a party. Lenin's book, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,* served the *political* preparation of such a party. Finally, Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* served the *theoretical preparation* of such a party."

After such a thorough historical preparation, the Prague Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. [Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party] (January, 1912), launched the party of a new type, the Party of Leninism, the *Bolshevik* Party. The Prague conference carried through the cleansing of the proletarian party of opportunists, of Mensheviks. This was of momentous and decisive significance for the further development of the Party and the revolution.

A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U. shows how the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution has enriched and developed Marxism.

As early as 1905, in his masterpiece, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,* Lenin projected the basic outlines of the theory of the socialist revolution. Heretofore, in our propaganda work, we usually dealt with only one side of this epochal Leninist work, that is, the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the democratic revolution, the line of the Bolsheviks which aimed at the hegemony of the proletariat, and an alliance with the peasantry, in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The third chapter of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* reveals in its full historical greatness the Leninist theory of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, the new theory of the regrouping of forces around the proletariat toward the end of the bourgeois revolution for the direct transition to the socialist revolution.

Lenin brought to light and restored the brilliant theses of Marx, which had been immured by the opportunists of the Second International, regarding permanent revolution and the necessity of linking the peasant revolutionary movement with the proletarian revolution. But Lenin did not simply restore and reiterate these brilliant thoughts of Marx—"but developed them further and reformulated them into a coherent theory of the socialist revolution, bringing in a new factor as an *indispensable* condition for the socialist revolution—the *unity* of the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements of city and country as a requisite for the victory of the proletarian revolution." (*A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*)

In 1915 Lenin discovered the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism. Proceeding from this law Lenin formulated his brilliant conclusion of the possibility for the proletariat to make a breach in the imperialist front at some one or several places, the conclusion of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possibility of the victory of socialism to begin with in several capitalist countries, or even in one, single capitalist country.

"This was a new, consummated theory of the socialist revolution, the theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in individual countries, of the conditions for its victory, of the perspectives for such victory, a theory the bases of which were outlined by Lenin back in 1905 in his pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution.*" (*Ibid.*)

This theory differed basically from the conception which was prevalent among the Marxists in the pre-imperialist period of capitalism, when Marxists believed that the victory of socialism in one country was impossible, that the victory of socialism would take place simultaneously in all civilized countries. Lenin, on the basis of the data on *imperialist* capitalism cited in his remarkable book, *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* reversed this conception as obsolete, and provided a new theoretical conception in which a simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries is considered *impossible* and the victory of socialism in one, single capitalist country is acknowledged as possible.

The inestimable significance of the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution consists not only in that it has advanced Marxism and enriched it with a new theory. Its significance consists further in that it gives a revolutionary perspective to the proletariat in individual countries, unlooses its initiative for an attack on its own national bourgeoisie, teaches it to utilize the conditions of war for the organization of such an attack, and strengthens its faith in the victory of the proletarian revolution.

"Such was the theoretical and tactical position of the Bolsheviks on the question of war, peace and revolution." (*Ibid.*)

It can be said without exaggeration that no advanced theory in the world has been or is of such momentous significance for the fate of humanity, for the transformation of the world, as the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution.

Under the banner of this theory, under the banner of creative Marxism, the great October Socialist Revolution was victorious. The Leninist theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country was successfully defended in the struggles with the opportunists, the enemies of socialism, by the continuer of the work of Lenin—Comrade Stalin. In the epoch of construction of socialist society in the U.S.S.R., in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat, Comrade Stalin developed further the Leninist theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism, and armed with this theory the entire Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people.

In our country the great words of Marx, that "theory becomes a material force as soon as it seizes hold of the masses," have become a reality. Armed with the Leninist-Stalinist idea of the possibility of building a full socialist society, the Party and the Soviet people have achieved the victories of the First and Second Five-Year Plans of world historic significance, have built in the main a socialist society on one-sixth of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the globe. Thus, before the whole world, have been proved the possibility and the historic inevitability of the replacement of the capitalist system by the socialist system.

The fourth chapter of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.,* dealing with the famous book of Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* is devoted to the exposition and establishment of the *theoretical* basis of the Party of Lenin-Stalin—dialectical and historical materialism. This chapter, classical in its content as well as in its form, is so important for an understanding of Marxism-Leninism, that it must be studied with particular thoroughness and must be mastered by the Bolsheviks, Party and non-Party, and first and foremost, by every active worker of the Bolshevik Party.

"Dialectical and historical materialism constitute the theoretical foundation of Communism, the theoretical bases of the Marxist party; and knowledge of this basis, therefore, the mastering of it, is the duty of every active worker of our Party." (*Ibid.*)

The section on dialectical and historical materialism, as well as the other theoretical sections of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.,* is a most valuable theoretical contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx, Engels and Lenin repeatedly spoke of the necessity of a brief and comprehensive exposition of the theoretical views of Marxism, of a popular and concise exposition of the teachings of dialectics. The fourth chapter gives just such a concise exposition and scientific establishing of the philosophical-theoretical views of Marxism, an exposition of dialectical materialism as a consummate and unified world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist Party.

Our Party, whose world outlook is dialectical materialism, has always approached its problems from the point of view of Marxist science. The fourth chapter of the book gives a number of remarkably vivid and interesting examples of the application of the dialectical method to the political activity of the party of the proletariat.

Thus in the fourth chapter we read:

". . . if the transition of slow quantitative changes into rapid and sudden qualitative changes constitutes the law of development, then it is clear that revolutionary upheavals brought about by oppressed classes are entirely natural and inevitable phenomena.

"Hence, the transformation from capitalism to socialism, and the liberation of the working class from capitalist oppression, can be achieved, not by way of gradual alterations, not by way of reform, but only through a qualitative change of the capitalist order through revolution.

"Hence, in order not to make mistakes in politics, one must be a revolutionary, and not a reformist.

"Furthermore, if development takes place through the unfolding of inherent contradictions, through the clash of opposing forces on the basis of these contradictions, thus resolving these contradictions, it is clear that the class struggle of the proletariat is an entirely natural and inevitable phenomenon.

"Hence, the contradictions of the capitalist relations should not be glossed over, but exposed and unfolded, should not be suppressed, but should be developed to the end.

"Hence, in order not to make mistakes in politics, it is necessary to carry out an uncompromising proletarian class policy, and not a reformist policy seeking harmony between the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, not a conciliatory policy which assumes that capitalism 'grows into' socialism.

"That is how to understand the Marxist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dialectical method, if one takes it in application to social life, in application to the history of society."

Heretofore, our propaganda textbooks on dialectical and historical materialism, as a rule, dealt with dialectics in such a "dry" manner, wrote of dialectics in so obscure and dry a style, enumerated so many laws of dialectics, failing to distinguish the primary from the secondary, to line up dialectics with this political activity of the Party of the proletariat, that very often we simply frightened people away from dialectics. . . . And, yet, dialectics is the very life, the soul, of Marxism! The fourth chapter of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* demonstrates how dialectical materialism should be taught in a clear and interesting manner while maintaining a high scientific level.

The application of dialectical materialism to the phenomena in the life of society, to the study of the development of society, to the study of the history of society, is *historical materialism*. The fourth chapter makes an invaluable contribution to the theory of historical materialism of Marx-Engels-Lenin, constituting its continuation and further theoretical development. The theory of historical materialism is placed on a basis of the great experience of the entire struggle of the working class and—what is particularly important—on the basis of the experience of the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. This theory has now passed through such a historical test as never before in history.

The theory of historical materialism in *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* bases itself on the experience of the entire history of humanity—from the primitive communal order of society to the victory of socialism. All social formations—the primitive commune, the slave system, feudalism, capitalism and socialism—are analyzed from the point of view of the laws of the development of production, the laws of the economic development of society.

Thus, we read in the fourth chapter of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*:

"The power and vitality of Marxism-Leninism lie in the fact that it bases its practical activity precisely on the needs of the development of the material life of society, never detaching itself from the actual life of society."

Deducting the origin of social ideas, theories, viewpoints, political institutions from the needs and conditions of the material life of society, historical materialism does not deny the converse reaction of the ideological and political superstructures on the material life of society but, on the contrary, emphasizes the serious role and significance in the life of society, in the history of society, of social ideas, theories, viewpoints, political institutions:

"Social ideas, theories, political institutions, having arisen on the basis of the matured problems of the development of the material life of society, the development of social being—themselves react then on social being, on the material life of society, creating the necessary conditions to bring to completion the solution of the matured problems of the material life of society and to render possible its further development.

"The force and vitality of Marxism-Leninism lie in the fact that it bases itself on an advanced theory correctly reflecting the needs for the development of the material life of society, that it raises theory to its rightful

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

level, and considers it as its duty to utilize to the end its mobilizing, organizing, and transforming force. Thus, historical materialism solves the problem of the relation between social being and social consciousness, between the conditions of the development of the material life and the development of the spiritual life of society."

The Stalinist style, the Stalinist dialectical logic—this is what characterizes *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*, particularly its theoretical chapters. Only one who knows the classical works of Marxism-Leninism to perfection, one who has mastered dialectical materialism to perfection and stands on the heights of contemporary advanced science, one who understands more deeply than anyone else the laws of development of society and who can see further than anyone else the historical destinies of humanity, could so profoundly and clearly state the theoretical basis of the Marxist-Leninist Party, dialectical and historical materialism.

* * *

The inexhaustible theoretical wealth contained in *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.* demands a thorough, patient, careful study and *mastery*. This book, of world significance, ideologically arms the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people for the further struggle for communism, passing on the gigantic, vast historical experience of the Party of Lenin and Stalin to the world proletariat. It will be studied by, and through it will be educated, generations of fighters for communism throughout the world. The immediate important problem is, first of all, *to prepare well the propagandists* to master thoroughly the entire ideological wealth of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This is a pre-conditon for a correct and thorough organization of the study of *A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*

A BOLSHEVIK PROPAGANDIST*

THE publication of *A Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* places before the Party with all vigor the problem of the preparation of Party propagandists, raising their role and significance. Our teachers face a big and serious task. They will have to bring to the attention of our study circles and classes every word of the remarkable textbook, to convey to the Communists the entire wealth of the Leninist-Stalinist revolutionary theory, to teach all members of the Party how to wield this powerful ideological weapon to perfection.

The carrying out of such a responsible task to a great extent depends upon the ability of the Party organizations to raise the role of the propagandists to the necessary level and to give every possible assistance to the teaching personnel in their everyday activities.

To be a Party teacher is an assignment that confers honor upon a member of the Communist Party. The guiding of Party education is entrusted by our Party to politically consistent, most tried and tested Com-

* From *Pravda*, September 20, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munists. To be a propagator of the ideas of Bolshevism, an educator of the Party membership, is a great honor which indicates the confidence of the Party in this comrade. It is something to be proud of and valued highly.

The history of the Bolshevik Party clearly and convincingly teaches us how our Party, in every epoch of its struggle, devoted great attention to propagandist work, what significance it attached to Party teachers. Comrades Lenin and Stalin, as well as other leading comrades of the Party, were organizers of Party education, directed study circles, Party schools, tirelessly impressed our teachers with the responsibility of their task. For a Marxist-Leninist Party the question of propaganda, of the people who bring the revolutionary theory to the masses, is a question of paramount importance. In his letter to the students of the Party school held on the Island of Capri, Comrade Lenin wrote:

"In every school the most important thing is the ideological-political trend of the lecturer. How is this trend determined? Entirely and exclusively by the composition of the teaching staff (lecturers)."

While paying great attention to the level of propaganda, to its political trend and depth, Comrades Lenin and Stalin emphasized the significance of the composition of the teaching staff, demanding that this task be assigned only to those who deserve the confidence of the Party, who without distortion and fully armed with knowledge, will educate our Party cadres.

A Bolshevik propagandist is distinguished first of all by his supreme devotion to the cause of Lenin-Stalin, by his Bolshevik principles and by his irreconcilability and mercilessness toward enemies. A Party propagandist is not a bookworm, not a dry narrator; he is a *fighter* for the Party, one who develops in his students Bolshevik steadfastness, revolutionary zeal, the ability to be able to unmask and destroy the enemy, one who places in the hands of Communists the sharp ideological weapon of Bolshevism.

A Party propagandist must be able to detect the slightest political falsification, the slightest appearance of political decadence; he is vigilant, an indefatigable guardian of the interests of the Party.

A Bolshevik propagandist is also distinguished by his constant self-study, continuously improving his knowledge of the Marxist-Leninist theory, striving to understand the heart of Marxism-Leninism.

"To master the Marxist-Leninist theory does not at all mean to memorize all the formulae and conclusions and to cling to every letter of these. In order to master Marxist-Leninist theory, it is necessary first of all to learn how to distinguish its letter from its substance.

"To master the theory of Marxism-Leninism means to understand the substance of this theory and to learn to apply this theory when deciding upon practical problems of the revolutionary movement in the various conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat." (*A Short Course in the History of the C.P.S.U.*)

To his students, the propagandist must bring, not isolated conclusions, not dogmas, because one cannot look upon the Marxist-Leninist theory as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith: it must reveal the substance of this science and convey deep knowledge.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is it not clear then that all this can be achieved only through systematic and serious study by our propagandist personnel?

This condition is particularly obligatory because among our propagandists there are still some who approach the study of the history of the C.P.S.U. in a very superficial maner. There are some who still reckon that the publication of a new textbook lessens the responsibility of the propagandist—as long as the students have the textbook the teacher will not have to spend much time on clarifying questions. With such ignoramuses it is necessary to carry on a decisive struggle and well cleanse their brains by explaining to them the actual significance of the textbook. *The Party organization must strive to achieve such a condition where the appearance of a teacher at a study circle (or class) unprepared will be an unusual event and such disgraceful facts will become known to the whole Party organization.*

It is time to free ourselves from such impudent individuals who here and there still pursue propagandist work but who do not desire to study, who consider that they know it all, but actually are ignorant chatterboxes.

It is the profound duty of the Party organizations and their leaders to check up on the content of the work in the study circles, the quality of their studies and the level of propaganda. This task will be made considerably easier if the leading Party comrades will take the task of organizing and leading propaganda work and will themselves become propagandists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FALL OF WUHAN AND PROSPECTS OF CHINA'S VICTORY

BY RUDY BAKER

THE fall of the Wuhan cities and the loss of Canton were heavy blows to China's struggle for liberation. Now China is left without a single seaport or great industrial center; its main railways, navigable rivers and highways are in the hands of the invading armies. If this were a war between two imperialist nations, China could well be considered defeated; in fact, to have been doomed to defeat before the war began. It is precisely in the profound political and economic differences between China and Japan that we can find the basis for China's unswerving faith in the final victory over the fascist invader. This faith in victory is not founded on subjective wishes, but on hard realism arising from a sober examination of the economic, social, and political forces operating in the respective countries.

Great alarm was felt by the friends of China at the fall of Hankow. While the international atmosphere was still tense with the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, Japan's troops marched into the backyard of Hongkong suspiciously to seize Canton without fighting. Within a few days, Hankow fell amidst a loudly organized campaign of peace rumors. It appeared that anything was possible after Munich. The Japanese War Ministry, in effect, revived the world's faith in China by warning the people of Japan that peace was still far away, that several more years of warfare were needed. And China, assembling its National Political Council, its symbol of democracy, coolly and confidently assured the world that its resistance would go until the invader was driven into the Pacific Ocean.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LOSS OF WUHAN

Wuhan cities represented the last major industrial center and the direct railway link with the Northwest (where the Eighth Route army operates) and the southern ports of Canton and Hongkong. Undoubtedly, industry and lines of communication with the outside world are of decisive importance to China's defense. These heavy losses encouraged the pro-Japanese elements and the vacillating circles who refused or feared to grasp the full significance and mighty power of the vast potential forces of hundreds of millions of their awakening countrymen. These are the dangerous enemies in the life-blood of China that must be eliminated. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eventual loss of China's ports and *concentrated* industrial centers was not unexpected. All these centers and ports were either on the coast, along the Yangtse River, or on railways, and consequently vulnerable to attack by the Japanese navy, tanks, and superior artillery. China was a weak and disunited nation on the eve of Japan's invasion and only began gathering strength and power from its newly found unity after the war had begun. During the first six months of the war it lost no less than 75 per cents of its concentrated industrial areas (Tientsin, Shanghai, Soochow, Tsingtao, Nanking, etc.). Note that it took Japan *three weeks* to seize Tientsin, *three months* to take Shanghai, and *six months* to conquer Wuhan. The loss of the industrial centers was costly; but despite these great losses we witness a phenomenal qualitative improvement in the defensive and striking capacity of the Chinese armies.

During the first three months of the war (at Shanghai) the ratio of casualties was estimated as high as ten to one in favor of Japan. During the six months' defense of the approaches to Hankow the ratio was virtually even, in fact, growing unfavorable to Japan. This is a major achievement, dramatically illustrating the growth of the fighting capacity of China's armies in contrast to the slow deterioration of Japan's. The loss of its industrial centers is the price China must pay for the eventual recovery and liberation of the entire country. While the fall of Shanghai resulted in the destruction of nearly all industrial enterprises, the later losses, including the fall of both Canton and Wuhan cities, were preceded by timely and systematic evacuation of industry to the invulnerable interior. While China lost its *concentrated* industrial centers, it should be known that numerous small-scale industries, arsenals and extensive handicraft industry, together with essential raw materials, abound in the vast unconquered interior regions. During the sixteen months of the war, uninterrupted supplies of war materials and vital industrial equipment flowed into China via Hongkong in anticipation of the eventual fall of Canton. Simultaneously, three additional lines of communication were used and improved, and now function effectively, through French Indo-China, British Burma, and the long but invulnerable road through Sinkiang to the Soviet Union. From the standpoint of war supplies the fall of Wuhan is far from decisive.

FACTORS DETERMINING CHINA'S VICTORY

Japan's central military objective has been the destruction of China's armies. Japan is further from achieving this objective than at any time since the war began. Chinese armies, though suffering heavy losses, are not only intact, but tremendously enlarged and improved, having been supplemented by a million armed guerilla fighters operating in the rear of Japanese armies.

China's ultimate victory rests on the political awakening and systematic organization of its vast population, which is seven times larger than Japan's. The incalculable power of more than four hundred million people consciously fighting against foreign bondage is a force of tremendous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political and military significance. The pent-up revolutionary energies of China are now in the process of being mobilized and unleashed against the chief enemy of the people's liberties and pursuit of happiness. This mighty force was partly aroused in the revolutionary struggle for liberation in 1925-27. Following that, the small Red Army proved invincible against six major campaigns by superior forces because its power was founded in the awakened and organized people in the limited Soviet Districts. This significant fact did not escape Chiang Kai-shek and the ruling circles of China when the fateful decision was reached to resist Japan to the end. It must, however, be said that the full use of this mighty potential force of the people has not been made to date. The ruling classes of China, facing annihilation at the hands of Japanese imperialists, rely basically on the people; yet they display fear and hesitation to utilize fully the mighty weapon which alone can save them and the country from colonial slavery.

After the fall of Nanking last December, Chiang Kai-shek made a statement to the effect that the center of decisive struggle in the course of long protracted resistance against the invader lies neither in Nanking nor in other big cities, but rather in the countryside and villages throughout the nation and in the firm determination of broad masses of the people to resist. This coincides with the resistance proposals of the Communists of China who have set brilliant examples of political and military mobilization of the people on their sectors of the front, where Japan had received its most severe punishment.

Political unification of China means precisely the involving of the vast masses of people in consciously organized participation in the war for *their* liberation. It means unifying all anti-Japanese parties and groups, as well as freeing the people from the worst forms of political restrictions and exploitation. Before the entire people of China can effectively and enthusiastically fight against the foreign invader, their economic burdens must be eased and they must be given a minimum of democratic rights to exercise their initiative, to mobilize the economic resources and the fighting forces of the country. The problem of organizing victorious resistance is in the first place a political problem of organizing the people. The solution of the military problem flows from the awakened people. The army becomes the mighty fist of a mighty people bound to it with a million ties in the conduct of the revolutionary war for independence.

This organization of resistance is now proceeding in China at an accelerated tempo.* In this lies the hope and assurance of victory. The devolopment of firm, unified leadership of the war is an equally decisive factor. This, also, is proceeding along generally favorable lines. The problem of forging a unified leadership is extremely difficult in China, due to the existence of wide differentiations among the present ruling circles. Chiang Kai-shek represents the dominating circles of the ruling classes, which are prepared to fight to the end

* We refer the reader to Comrade Baker's article, "The Communist Party in China's War for Liberation," in *The Communist* for November.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in close cooperation with the Communist Party and all anti-Japanese groups. But there are circles that still hope that an agreement can be reached with Japan whereby their class interests may be partially preserved in a Japanese-controlled colonial system. These groupings, in cooperation with the Trotskyites, sow seeds of defeatism, obstruct the unification processes, and oppose granting an extension of democracy.

In each successive crisis some people question the reliability of Chiang Kai-shek. But Chiang's reliability is not basically a question of personal integrity or strength of character. Before the war Chiang's power rested insecurely on narrow circles among the ruling classes dominating the Kuomintang, the party in power. Today the Kuomintang is a broader party embracing vastly broader circles of the population and the masses.

The vastly increased power and prestige of Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang are now based on the firm line of policy and practice of conducting the war of liberation. In addition, there is the powerful support of the Communist Party, whose strength and influence have grown immeasurably since the war.

The overwhelming majority of the people, including the middle classes and ruling classes, support the Chiang Kai-shek government because of its uncompromising anti-Japanese policy.

Surely any serious attempt at peace negotiations now (unless Japan is defeated) would seriously weaken the unity of China. It would create a split. But it is no longer possible to betray the war. The consolidation of the anti-Japanese movement is by now firmly founded among the masses, and reliable forces are present to lead the war, irrespective of possible deflections of individuals or groups.

With the satisfactory solution of the stated major political problems, the tasks of mobilizing the military and material resources of the country become simplified. Unlike Japan, with its complicated and intricately balanced economic and political structure, China is basically a simple agrarian country with a simple economy and financial system. Its unity, simplicity and vastness are the sources of its strength in the present crisis. The port cities and coastal industrial centers represented the artificial developments of foreign imperialist invasions and did not arise from, but rather hindered, the normal economic development of China. Their loss was a costly blow in the war emergency, but did not vitally affect the internal economy of the country. Such losses would be fatal to modern industrial nations. This simple economy further fits China's basic military strategy of *protracting the war in order to wear out the enemy* and to gain time to mobilize the people and the resources of China. Time is on the side of China. The vast unconquered regions of China are virtually without modern highways. In these undeveloped regions the highly mechanized Japanese army loses its advantages. Here the Chinese armies become superior.

The superb examples of mobile warfare set by the Eighth Army have been largely adopted by the General Staff as standard tactics. The sensational victory of the Chinese troops at Taierchwang last spring was the first fruit of the new tactics. In the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uncharted areas of the interior Japanese troops will be permitted to advance into well laid traps where they can be easily surrounded and decimated. Supplementing the growing Chinese armies, the million guerilla warriors are transforming the Japanese rear into a new front. The regular army becomes fused with the armed people. The devastating effect of guerilla warfare, coordinated with the mobile war of maneuver, becomes extremely dangerous and costly to the invader operating with long lines of communications supplying their 2,500 miles of front in a vast hostile country.

JAPAN'S FATAL WEAKNESSES

With some recent notable exceptions, Japan has won every important battle in the war. These exceptions did not prove the proverbial rule but rather exploded the alleged invincibility of Japan's war machine. Japan has captured and devastated China's coastal cities, while its own country and industries did not suffer from direct war destruction. And yet it can be said, with considerable certainty, that Japan will lose the war in China. The long boasted claim that Japan's army is a first class army has already been shattered. The alleged unity of Japan's people is a carefully built-up myth. The Japanese people are sullen and unwilling pawns in the predatory war. While China introduces and extends democracy, fascist military rule has destroyed all vestiges of it in Japan, transforming the country into a military prison. Japan dares not trust its own people.

Japanese disproportionate military power conceals its semi-feudal agriculture and the small-scale semi-handicraft industry on which it is based. Japan's military might is resting on a foundation of strains and stresses created by the most profound internal contradictions. Half its population, the peasantry, is subjected to semi-feudal exploitation and to hopeless, ever-deepening feudal poverty which sets the living standards for the cruelly exploited proletariat. The small industry of the middle classes is retarded in its normal development by the highly centralized monopoly control of finance capital in the grip of a handful of wealthy families.

Capitalist development in Japan has not uprooted the powerful feudal survivals which hinder the development of a home market requiring a growing buying power of the people. Native industry (for home consumption) and the living standards of the people have hardly passed the feudal levels of the last few centuries. The single highly developed modern industry is textile, which produces solely for the export markets. The only other significant modern industries are the direct war industries. Because Japan lacks adequate material resources necessary for a modern industrial nation, it has failed to develop a normal balanced economy. To secure the vast quantities of raw materials for its war needs from abroad it orients it economy primarily on export and armaments.

The vast demands of the unexpectedly protracted war have unbalanced its intricately organized economy. War needs, international boycotts, and shortage of raw materials are ruining the export industries and are subjecting the entire

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy to a terrific strain. The cost of the war, however, mounts daily; taxes grow, the cost of living mounts, inflation is accelerated, deficit bonds cannot be absorbed, the income of the people declines, unrest in the colonies becomes menacing, class contradictions become intensified, and the rule of fascist military dictatorship becomes more rigid and violent. The sharpening inner contradictions are developing a pent-up force that is bound to explode with tremendous social detonations. The people are realizing that this is a predatory war benefiting only the wealthy ruling class. Japan is resting on a social volcano. While the worst of China's feudal survivals are being eased and some liquidated in the fires of the war for liberation, the feudal survivals of Japan, together with growing oppression at home and in the colonies, are being buttressed with bayonets to prevent their being burst asunder by the mounting social pressure of the people. In this situation, the small heroic Communist Party of Japan resolutely carries on its historic task of preparing and uniting the people to defeat the military fascist dictatorship, despite the most cruel and savage persecution.

TASKS AHEAD

The foregoing analysis of internal weaknesses and contradictions of Japanese imperialism explains the desperate adventurism of the fascist military ruling class. As the inner contradictions become intensified its policy of aggression becomes bolder and more adventurous. It is staking everything on the gamble to crush China as the first step in its wild aim of conquering the world. In this totalitarian war the militarist adventurers do not hesitate to trample on the interests of Britain, France and the United States. Already they have proclaimed virtual monopoly over all China and the Far East.

Their reckless adventurism, coupled with their stated aim of conquering the entire Pacific basin, confronts the entire world with the danger of being drawn into the bloody conflict. While their ambitions received a sharp setback on the Soviet Union's borders last summer, the Munich agreement has given them new courage and boldness. This latest fascist conspiracy is part and parcel of the infamous "Anti-Comintern" Pact directed against wold democracy and whets the appetite of the fascist gangster in the Pacific area.

Unless steps are taken to discourage and quarantine this dangerous enemy of mankind, the people of the Pacific countries, including the United States, face grave consequences.

In this dangerous situation the United States of America supplies the fascist war-makers of Japan with 54 per cent of its vital war materials.

This shameful act makes America a silent partner and an accomplice of Japan in the savage attack upon the people of China, and supplies the Japanese war-makers with the means to create a basis for a future attack upon the people of the United States. American munition manufacturers are aiding Japan to conquer China and realize their ambitions of world conquest.

The mutual interests of the people of China and America require and de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mand that this shameful traffic with Japan be stopped by the American government.

An embargo on war goods to Japan will be America's greatest single contribution to safeguarding peace and democracy in the Pacific basin. The deep sympathy and admiration of America for China's heroic people must also find their expression in the form of government credits, food, clothing, and arms to China, in order to enable them to achieve independence. The people of America can give immediate and effective expression of their solidarity with the people of China by intensifying the boycott of Japanese goods.

"The real history of our country, now being excavated from under the refuse and falsifications of race prejudice, shows that the American Negroes have always played a progressive role. . . . The struggles of the Negroes, for voting rights, the Herndon case, the Scottsboro case, the organization of Negroes and whites in unions on the waterfronts, in the steel and textile mills, on the farms, will be an important factor in awakening the South to progressive action."

James W. Ford, *The Negro and the Democratic Front,* p. 203.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHILIPPINES MOBILIZE AGAINST JAPANESE AGGRESSION*

[*On October 29-31 the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands held its Third National Convention—amidst popular enthusiasm, after a successful fight for legality.*

Three hundred and eighty delegates from twelve provinces, including 57 delegates from the Socialist Party, adopted the convention resolutions, providing for: support for the extension of democracy, the struggle against fascism within and without, directing the main attack against Japanese fascist penetration, supporting the progressive measures of President Quezon, and also advancing the main demands of the workers and peasants.

The high point of the convention was reached when the merger of the Communist and Socialist Parties was unanimously approved. The name of the combined parties is "The Communist Party of the Philippines (Merger Socialist-Communist Parties)."

Crisanto Evangelista was elected National Chairman; Pedro Abad Santos, the venerable Socialist leader, National Vice-Chairman; and Guillermo Capadocia, General Secretary.—The Editors.]

* Draft statement approved by the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, August 26-28, 1938, and submitted to the Party membership for discussion in preparation for the National Convention of the Communist Party, October 29-31.

THE question of Philippine independence is now again being debated on all sides. A wide difference of opinion exists among Filipinos. Immediate and complete independence, dominion status, and extended commonwealth are among the solutions most often proposed. Upon the decision of our people depend the happiness, prosperity and security of our country. The Communist Party of the Philippine Islands wants to state its position on independence so fully and clearly that everyone will understand it and, we hope, accept it as his own.

DEMOCRACY VS. FASCISM

We cannot separate the destiny of our country from the destiny of mankind. In the world today two principal forces are locked in struggle. The rapacious fascist and militarist powers are engaged in a crusade against the democratic and peace-loving peoples. Italy has raped Ethiopia and is carrying on a war of invasion against republican Spain. Germany has seized Austria, is preparing to take Czechoslovakia, and carries on a war against democracy in Spain. Japan raped Manchuria, is engaged in a war for the domination of China and threatens the peace and autonomy of all the peoples of Asia and Malaysia. The fascists of Japan, Germany

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Italy are the war-makers, threatening the destruction of all the advances made by humanity through the centuries.

Opposed to them are the forces of democracy and peace. The democratic and peace-seeking peoples of the world have the honorable and historic mission of putting a stop to aggression, restoring and preserving peace, and clearing the way for the fullest development of democracy. The noble Spanish republicans are engaged in a decisive struggle against that same class of Spanish tyrants who held us in subjection for three centuries and who today accept the aid of the fascist foreign mercenaries against their own people. The Chinese people, in their heroic struggle for national salvation, are at the same time fighting our battle for democracy and independence. The vital issues which face mankind are democracy against fascism, peace against war, progress against reaction. The development of our democracy, the preservation of our national integrity, the well-being and prosperity of our people, the attainment of our complete independence are inseparable from the worldwide struggle of democracy against fascism.

Our country is not immune to the plots and aggression of the fascist powers. The agents of Franco, who at the same time represent the biggest Spanish monopoly interests in the Philippines, are freely engaged in organizing assistance to the rebels in Spain and in setting up groups of fascists in our country. Since the establishment of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio alliance, there can be no doubt that the agents of Franco are working in unison with the agents of these fascist powers to undermine and destroy our national autonomy.

We would condemn ourselves in advance to national suicide if we blinded ourselves to the fact that we lie in the direct path of the Japanese war of conquest. The Japanese fascists, allied with the fascists of Germany and Italy, are preparing a new world war against the forces of world democracy, and to this end they are ready to convert the Philippines into another militarist base for aggression against the peoples of the Far East. Japanese warships and secret agents are active throughout the Pacific and the Straits. Japan is entrenched in Formosa, near the northern end of our country; her warships and planes dominate our direct line of communication with Hongkong and Singapore; she has penetrated deeply in the Dutch East Indies and Borneo; from the Mandated Islands—she is in a position to send her bombing planes over the Philippines. In anticipation of becoming the master of the Philippines, Japanese officials have adopted the same arrogant attitude towards our government and our people as they have to China. On a number of occasions Tokio has already threatened us with a direful fate should we undertake any actions against the interests of the Japanese imperialists in our country. Their consular officials take advantage of diplomatic immunity to interfere in our internal affairs, even to the extent of restricting our democratic rights by demanding the abolition of all actions on behalf of our heroic brother people in China. Japan already considers herself the potential master of our country, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simply awaits the opportunity to fall upon us, with the connivance of traitors in our midst, and convert us into another Manchukuo, Korea or Formosa.

This supreme danger to our national integrity and to the prospects of independence cannot be ignored. We have a tremendous responsibility to our people and to the cause of world democracy. Our centuries-long fight for freedom, our heroic struggle against the Spanish tyrants and against the American imperialists, our persistent fight since then to regain our national patrimony, to win greater political liberties and to advance our cause of independence demand of us that we continue that glorious tradition until we have won our freedom. The martyrs of our revolution—Burgos, Rizal, Bonifacio, Luna—demand that we continue our persistent fight for freedom and democracy. The Communist Party, which has always held dear and sacred the memory of our martyrs and the sacrifices of our people for independence, believes that our common cause is too sacred to permit irresponsible and adventurist speculation to enter into deliberations on the question of independence. The Filipino people must chart such a source as will safeguard them against aggression by Japan, preserve their nationhood, strengthen the forces of world democracy and lead to independence, firmly based upon democracy and security against foreign aggression.

INDEPENDENCE, FIRM AND SECURE

The Communist Party of the Philippines holds inalienable the right of the Filipino people to self-determination, the right to independence. This right, for which the Filipino people have heroically and stubbornly fought throughout their history, has been recognized. It is recognized in the Independence Act, in which a progressive American government has solemnly guaranteed it for 1946, and confirmed by a plebiscite of our own people. This is a victory which we must zealously guard and defend. Yet, it is precisely this right to independence which is now endangered by the fascist aggressors. It is this right which we must preserve as a basis for further *democratic gains,* and our eventual national independence. Our only hope of maintaining the right of independence and securing our freedom rests, not in reliance upon the Japanese military-fascists and their allies, but in our continued and firmer cooperation with the forces of world democracy.

The *right* to separate from the United States does not place upon us the *obligation* to separate. Whether our people chose to separate now or even in 1946, depends upon the specific situation under which we are asked to make this choice. In 1946, complete separation from the United States may be the best assurance of democracy and independence for our country. Under present circumstances, separation does not assure the best means towards the attainment of fuller democracy for the people and complete independence. *Immediate* severance of *all* relations with the United States would mean cutting ourselves loose from one of the most democratic powers in the Pacific, and would be a fatal blow to our independence, peace and security. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of the Filipino people lie in establishing their unity with the democratic and progressive forces in the United States and with the other democratic peoples, and not in an attitude which would favor the projects of fascism and place the Philippines under the heel of the Mikado.

The masses of our people in their traditional and ardent aspiration for freedom are the greatest force for democracy. The masses should be wary of unprincipled advocates of "independence right now, at all costs." Those persons either know not whereof they speak, or are agents of a foreign power, or innocent tools of such agents who are attempting to provoke us into blindly severing all relations with the United States. Fascism thrives upon the disunity of the people, and it is therefore in the interests of the aggressor fascist powers to induce a state of chaos and disunity among a people whom they intend to conquer. There are elements in our country who, under the slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics," are taking advantage of the aspirations of our people for freedom to create a false picture of Japan as a liberator.

Our people cannot and will not fall victim to this dangerous propaganda inspired by a power which has already enslaved a number of Eastern peoples and is seeking to subdue all of Asia. The bearers of this propaganda among our people are engaged in the criminal, adventurist game of speculating upon the "assistance" of Japan in a revolt against our commonwealth and the United States. They are playing the same role as the Nazi agents played in Austria, which led to the seizure of that country by Germany. These elements are enemies of the people, traitors to our cause of democracy and independence. The course they are following, if they are not stopped, will turn us over to the tender mercies of the most reactionary and fascist circles which now dominate Japan.

At the same time the Communist Party is opposed to any form of permanent retention by the United States. American monopoly interests in the Philippines, supported by some Filipino sugar and other business circles closely tied to the American interests, are taking advantage of the dangerous situation in which our country finds itself, to urge the acceptance of perpetual American sovereignty. The chief issue now is not immediate independence versus some form of permanent American sovereignty. The chief issue now is democracy and the preservation of our national integrity versus fascism and militarist aggression. We see no reason or necessity for the Filipino people, under the pressure of internal and international forces, to commit themselves now to dominion, extended commonwealth, or any other status involving permanent American sovereignty.

The well-being of our people, the preservation and extension of our democratic rights and advancement of the cause of complete independence can best be obtained, under the present circumstances, within the form of relationship established under the Independence Act. We must defend and maintain all rights thus far won, which are contained in the Independence Act and in the Constitution of the Commonwealth in the form of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bill of Rights, a republican and democratic mode of government, a greater degree of self-government than we have up to now enjoyed, and the recognition of our right to independence. We must defend these rights against reactionary and fascist elements from within and against intervention and aggression from without. We must preserve our national patrimony from monopoly interests, protect and develop our resources and our industries.

At the same time, we must seek to broaden and extend our democracy and to obtain greater national autonomy even before the expiration of the Independence Bill. In fact, the further development of democratic relations would establish the best conditions for friendly and voluntary collaboration between the American and Filipino peoples. Under the present relationship it is possible to achieve even greater self-government and autonomy on all matters relating to the welfare of the Filipino people, and to obtain equal rights for our nationals in Hawaii and in the United States. If the revision of the Independence Act should become a question of the moment, the Communist Party would urge the Filipino people to favor the establishment of a democratic and independent Filipino republic, which would freely and voluntarily enter into treaties of political amity, mutual aid for purposes of defense, and trade reciprocity with the United States. The Filipino people can make this choice through a free plebiscite, and enjoy the complete fulfilment of our right of self-determination.

FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY, AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM

The question of our liberty cannot be separated from the question of war and peace. The Filipino people want peace. We do not want to see our cities and our barrios subjected to the kind of barbarian slaughter of the innocents which took place at Guernica, Barcelona, Madrid, Shanghai, Nanking, Amoy and Canton. Some people tell us that as long as we *retain* our relationship with the United States, our country will be turned into a battleground as the objective of the enemy. According to them, immediate and total independence would assure our isolation from any major conflict. Do these people seriously believe that Japan would not immediately seize the Philippines to use as a base against China, Dutch East Indies, Indo-China, and the United States? Or are they too dishonest to admit that what they really have in mind is that the Filipino people would be foolish enough to hand themselves over without a struggle to the Japanese militarists? We wish to assure them that the Filipino people will fight bravely and courageously, as they have in the past, for their freedom, and that they will fight on the side of progress and democracy against reaction and fascism.

It is not too late to avoid the world war which the fascist powers are preparing, which they have already begun. But the way to do so is not the way of retreat before every threat or advance made by the fascist powers. As long as China retreated before every threat of the Japanese militarists and attempted to compromise with the aggressor at the expense of its na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional integrity, Japan took Manchuria, then established its hegemony in North China and continued to place further humiliating demands before the Chinese people. Only when the national unity of the Chinese people was forged on the basis of the united front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party was effective resistance established which made every Japanese advance costly, administered a number of resounding defeats to Japanese arms, and has shown to the world that China will fight to a victorious end against the aggressor.

The way to preserve and restore peace is the road of collective security against aggression, the road of collaboration between all the democratic peoples to quarantine the war-makers. If the fascists and militarists have had free reign, it is because the democratic powers have wavered, failing thus far to enforce collective sanctions against aggressors. But the democratic peoples are clamoring for their governments to act, and we must add the united support of our people to that of the democratic and progessive forces in the United States for the application of the policies of collective security and quarantining the agressor, as proclaimed in the speech of President Roosevelt on October 5, 1937.

It is no accident that in the United States the most reactionary and anti-New Deal forces are to be found among the isolationists as well as among those who are clamoring the loudest for complete, absolute and immediate independence for the Philippines. Thus, Representative O'Malley, who speaks for the dairy trust, tries to play the role of an anti-imperialist by shouting for immediate independence for the Philippines and for a policy of isolationism.

Thus, Senator Vandenberg, leader of the most reactionary section of the Republican Party and opponent of every New Deal measure which benefits the people, as spokesman of the biggest monopoly capitalists, demands the independence of the Philippines.

Thus, Herbert Hoover, the glorified spokesman of big business, attempts to hide his fascist sympathies under the cloak of demagogic concern for democracy and liberty, attacks Roosevelt as "dictator," and in his fight against the progressive forces in the United States seeks to assure a free hand to the fascist powers in their barbarous crusade against democracy. The fascist and reactionary elements in the United States, the monopolists and big business, who are engaged in a ferocious drive against the standards of living and the democratic rights of the American people, are the chief forces blocking the path towards the realization of an American foreign policy for collective security.

Those people are the direct political descendants of President McKinley and the imperialists who raped our country while we were in the process of winning our independence from Spain. These are the elements who have connections abroad with the fascist and militarist powers, who connive with the agents of Italian, German and Japanese fascism in Latin America, and who would like to see fascism triumphant against the will and the desire of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Agitation for the immediate severance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of all relations with the United States at the present time plays into the hands of the most reactionary elements in the United States, who seize upon this agitation as a ground for demanding the complete withdrawal of the United States from the Far East and rejection of concerted action by the democratic powers to establish a system of collective security.

On the other hand, the labor and democratic movement in the United States, which is engaged in a fight constantly to improve the conditions of the people and to preserve their democracy against the fascists and monopolists, are rendering support to President Roosevelt's progressive policies and particularly are demanding that the policy of collective security and quarantining the war-makers be enforced. These are the people who remain loyal to the great democratic traditions of America, who are carrying on in the tradition of the People's Party and the Anti-Imperialist League, which demanded our independence when President McKinley sent troops against us.

A unity of the democratic peoples of the Western hemisphere—Canada, the United States, Mexico and the Latin-American countries—is being forged against fascism within these countries, against the plotting of the fascist powers, and for peace, democracy and security. The Good Neighbor policy, enunciated by President Roosevelt, as the guide to the relations of the U.S. to the countries in the Western hemisphere, is being put into practice by the peoples of these countries as a Good Neighbor policy between the democratic and progressive forces against reaction and fascism. The Filipino people, exposed as they are to the direct onslaught of Japanese militarism, can preserve their national autonomy and guarantee independence and security by adherence to the democratic front of the Western hemisphere.

A great responsibility rests upon us. We are a link between the democratic and progressive peoples of the Western Hemisphere and the peoples of the East. Japan, which is the chief carrier of the fascist front in the East, is allied with Germany and Italy, the bearers of the fascist crusade in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere, where Japan is also active. If we permit the Japanophiles to dictate our policies, we will weaken the forces of democracy both in Asia and in the Americas. We bear a great responsibility to the heroic Chinese people, to the suppressed democratic forces in Japan, to our Malaysian brothers in the Dutch East Indies, to Indo-China and India, to the people of the Americas. We are happy to bear this responsibility, since it is tied up with our own cause of democracy and independence.

IMPROVE THE CONDITIONS OF THE PEOPLE

The fate of democracy and the cause of independence are bound up with the vital demands of the masses. The struggle for liberty is inseparable from the struggle to improve the conditions of the masses. Full democracy provides the best conditions for carrying on the struggle for a better life; the full freedom of the people to fight for better conditions strengthens democracy. The movement of the masses of the people must not be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feared. The initiative of the masses must be encouraged and their actions supported—for the popular movement of the masses is the best guarantee of democracy, of preserving the national integrity of our country and of establishing a free and democratic republic.

The main danger to our liberty and our democratic institutions, which we are seeking to develop and extend further, are the fascist adventurists and Japanophile elements. Allied with the agents of Franco and his supporters, with some fascist-minded American monopolists in our country, and with a small clique of Filipino reactionaries, these elements threaten to destroy democracy, force our country into a tacit suicidal alliance with the forces of world reaction and utilize the cause of Filipino independence to defeat the forces of progress and democracy.

The Communist Party declares that the main issue now is democracy versus fascism. We pledge ourselves to the defense of all democratic institutions against the subversive forces of reaction which are attempting to undermine them. We will be among the first to oppose, with everything within our power, the action of any conspiratorial group or clique, party, or organization, or any agency of a foreign power, which attempts to undermine and destroy the democratic institutions and the democratic rights of our country.

In pursuance of our aim to defend and extend democracy and to further the cause of independence, the Communist Party realizes the necessity of a system of national defense. We favor defense dedicated to the purpose of preserving the autonomy of our country against aggressors, and as a necessary step in the direction of independence and the attainment of full national sovereignty. The building of our national defense must go hand in hand with the building of our national industry. However, we can develop our national defense only in accordance with our means and the level of our economic development. To go beyond that would mean placing an unbearable burden upon our people. While accepting the technical aid of the United States and whatever other assistance may be offered, our country must place principal emphasis upon support of the policy of collective security as the best means of stopping the aggressor and restoring peace. Collaboration in such a policy with the democratic and progressive forces of the United States, and through them with China, the Dutch East Indies and Holland, Indo-China and France, and the Soviet Union offers the best means of protecting our national integrity. Although the Filipino people will fight stubbornly and heroically against the aggressor, it is clear that we can preserve our autonomy more easily and with less sacrifices, through collaboration with the democratic powers. Only those experts who are in the isolationist camp, or who would like to desert the Philippines entirely to the mercies of Japan, claim that our country is self-sufficient and impregnable. This kind of loose talk only has the effect of blinding our people to the real danger facing them and diverting them from a policy of collective security. If we should attempt to base our national defense upon a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy of *self-sufficiency* and *isolation,* as these people suggest, we would jeopardize our security and national safety. Besides, if the commonwealth, with the limited resources at its command, should attempt to put such a policy into operation, it could result only in attempting to build up armaments far beyond the ability or the endurance of the country to bear.

While supporting the policy of national defense and placing principal emphasis upon the need of collective security, the Communist Party points out that the burden of our national defense must not be permitted to fall upon the backs of the masses. On the initiative of President Quezon, the National Assembly has already taken some progressive steps, although still but a slight beginning, towards revising our system of taxation. In the interests of the national welfare of the people, taxes must be reduced for the poor, and increased against the large corporations, inherited fortunes and the higher incomes.

Under no circumstances must the armed forces be used against labor, the peasants, or the people fighting for better conditions, democracy and liberty; nor must they be used to interfere with the right of labor to organize and strike, or with the right of our people to assemble. The masses cannot trust a government which employs force against them. Our national army must become an army of the people, educated in the purposes of our national defense, in the spirit of democracy and cooperation with the people. Our Party holds that the best army is an army close to the people, and suggests that the national morale of our soldiers can be enhanced by instituting a system of popular learning, by protecting full freedom of conscience, by granting political rights to the army divisions.

Our Party is opposed to the policy of forceful assimilation being employed against the non-Christian peoples in our country. This policy, which is being enforced with the use of the army, can only result in disuniting the peoples of our Archipelago and in offering Japan or any other aggressor power a new base for intervention in the Philippines. We favor extending full equal rights to the Moro provinces, equal representation in the National Assembly, full freedom to pursue their own religion and cultural traditions, practical aid to help raise the economic level of those areas, the rights of self-government equal to those existing in the Filipino provinces, and the free right of self-determination. If we do not guarantee those rights to the Moro people, they will continue to distrust and hate the Filipino people and be turned away from us by reactionary and fascist forces who demagogically employ the slogan of liberation.

FOR THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

Our Party stands for national independence and the eventual establishment of socialism in our country. We believe that the problems of the Filipino people cannot be fully solved except under a free and democratic republic and under socialism, which is the highest form of democracy. In the Soviet Union, where socialism is established, the conditions of the masses are being continuously improved, unemployment does not exist, the land and industries are in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands of the people. The new Stalinist Constitution establishes as an organic law of the land the right of the people to work, as well as the right to leisure, and the fullest democracy yet enjoyed by mankind.

We recognize that our country has not yet reached the level of development where establishment of socialism is immediately possible and that this goal is not acceptable as yet to the majority of our people. We also recognize that even on the question of independence there is much disagreement. But we also recognize that the chief concern of our country now is to improve conditions of work and life, to defend and extend democratic liberties, to preserve our country from the ravages of intervention and war. The Communist Party, therefore, is ready to do all in its power to obtain these immediate objectives. The first essential condition is to establish the unity of the Filipino people, upon a basis of democracy and the public welfare.

We are ready to cooperate with all parties, political groups, labor, peasant and fraternal organizations, no matter what our differences may be with regard to ultimate aims and program, for the purpose of establishing a democratic front of the Filipino people, devoted to the improvement of our conditions, the defense and extension of our democratic rights, to safeguarding our national autonomy and furthering our cause of independence, peace and security. The unity of the Filipino people is absolutely necessary if we are to preserve our national integrity. Disrupters of the national unity, based upon the needs and desires of the Filipino people, are traitors to their people and to the cause of democracy and independence.

We call upon the Popular Alliance, all the parties and organizations which compose it, upon all the progressives and democrats of the Nationalist Party, upon all labor and peasant organizations, upon the youth and the women's organizations, to join with us to initiate and build the democratic national unity—the national democratic front—of the Filipino people. We offer President Quezon the consistent cooperation of our Party to organize mass support for, and to realize legislation of a progressive and democratic character, and to carry on further along the path of democracy. We stand ready to drop all differences of the past in the face of the present national emergency in order to make possible the democratic unity of the people. On the basis of a democratic front we see the possibility in the very near future of establishing the full unity of the people in support of a government which will demonstrate its resolve in no uncertain terms to carry out the program desired by the people.

Forward to the democratic front of the Filipino people!

For peace and democracy, against fascism and war!

Hail friendly collaboration between the American and Filipino peoples for democracy, peace and security!

For a free, prosperous and democratic Philippines!

Central Committee, Communist Party of the Philippine Islands,

CRISANTO EVANGELISTA,
National Chairman,

GUILLERMO CAPADOCIA,
General Secretary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CABLE OF GREETINGS FROM THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

It is with great happiness that I extend fraternal greetings to your National Convention on behalf of the National Committee and 80,000 members of the Communist Party of United States. The conditions under which your convention meets evidence the extension of democracy within the Philippines and the growing national unity of the Filipino people against the growing menace of reaction and fascism, especially against Japanese aggression which directly threatens the liberties and national sovereignty of the Philippines.

In the present world situation, the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, together with Filipino working people, is confronted with tasks of defending the national security of the Philippines against Japanese fascist aggression, improving the well-being of the Filipino masses, and of protecting and extending Philippine democracy as part of the movement towards the eventual complete self-determination of the Philippines.

Therefore, your convention, in placing in the forefront the problems of achieving working class unity, of forging a powerful national democratic front for peace and democracy, of building the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands into a mass Party championing the needs and rights of all the working people, and of strengthening the solidarity movement of political and material aid to the heroic Spanish and Chinese peoples, is advancing that program which can best defend and promote the most vital interests of the working people and the Philippine nation and Commonwealth.

I assure you that the Communist Party of United States, together with the rest of the American labor and progressive movement which is building a democratic people's front for democracy, security and peace, will strengthen its fraternal ties and solidarity with the Filipino people. We will vigorously extend our common struggle against the economic royalists and pro-fascist monopolies who seek to destroy American democracy, violate the Good Neighbor policy of the Roosevelt administration, and strive to steer America onto the path of fascism and war.

Long live the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands and its leader, Comrade Crisanto Evangelista!

Long live the unity of Filipino workers and people and international working class solidarity for peace, democracy and social progress!

Long live the friendship and collaboration of the Filipino people with the American, Chinese and Spanish peoples, and with the free and democratic peoples of the great Soviet Union, for democracy, liberty and peace!

EARL BROWDER,
General Secretary, C.P.U.S.A.

October 25, 1938

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARTY BUILDING IN THE NORTHWEST

BY LOUIS SASS

Organizational Secretary, Communist Party, Northwest District

IN THE report of Comrade Stachel to the enlarged meeting of the Political Committee of our Party,* we find great emphasis placed on the problem of organization, on Party building. From the report it is evident that in many of our districts Party building is not the necessary accompaniment of mass work. In fact, it appears that in many places where our Party is engaged in mass work of great importance, where we are a leading factor in building the democratic front, where many of our members are recognized leaders of mass trade unions, Party building progresses at a comparatively slower pace than in the same places prior to the Party's increased mass activity.

This almost unbelievable phenomenon reminds me of a conversation I once held with an outstanding leader in the movement for political realignment in the United States, who told me: "Why don't you Communists give up your label and your Party, and work as individuals in this growing movement of progress? Don't you know that your label is a handicap? Don't you know that you could do much better work without it?" This leader, who very often resorts to subtle Red-baiting, wanted to escape the Red-baiting attacks of reactionaries upon himself by getting rid of the Communist label and the Communist Party.

Comrade Browder in his San Francisco and Seattle speeches** declared: "We cannot compromise with Red-baiting; give the Red-baiters a finger and they will take your whole soul." He sounded an important reason for the great discrepancy between the growth of our Party in numbers and the growth in its influence. There is not much talk nowadays about the "Red scare among the Reds," he remarked, but that does not mean that we have done away with it. Daily, when the problem of recruting is brought to the attention of one of the mass leaders, the answer is in almost all instances the same: "In my position one has to be very careful not to be branded a Red." It is not necessary to polemize here against this idea; for the answer is too obvious. The question must, however, be posed; for it is necessary to trace this discrepancy

* Held in New York City on September 24-25, 1938.—*The Editors.*

** August 25 and Sept. 2-4, respectively.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between Party growth and Party prestige, not in the behavior of certain mass organizations and trade union leaders, but in something much more fundamental which is responsible for the behavior of these mass leaders. Deeper examination will show that it is the lack of a consistent fighting policy on the part of district leaders for the *line* of our Party in regard to Party building.

Does the line of our Party consist only of our strategy, our set of tactics, in a given period? Or does it also embrace responsibility for intensifying the growth and consolidation of our organization, as a result of the application of the correct tactics, as a result of a sound political analysis in regard to local and national problems? No one can say that we have correctly applied the line of the Party to a given situation *without showing the results of this correct application in Party growth.*

It is in this light that the report of Comrade Stachel has to be interpreted and applied by the district organizations the country over. In his report, Comrade Stachel has given the Northwest District considerable prominence for its work in applying the policies of the Party, not only to building the democratic front and strengthening unity in the trade union movement, but, most particularly, to making the Party grow simultaneously with the movement for unity. Far from being complacent at the favorable comments of Comrade Stachel, we feel that we owe it to the Party to live up to the opinion of our National Committee by speedily correcting our weaknesses that make our growth as well as the growth of many other districts far slower than the Party's developing influence in the mass movement. With this in mind we proceed to discuss our organizational weaknesses.

THE PARTY IN MASS WORK

Following the city campaigns in March, 1938, in the state of Washington, the Party has grown with comparatively great speed in places where our members actively participated with the progressive forces in those campaigns. In April, Kings County recruited 172 members, a substantial recruiting figure. This recruiting was the result of the fact that our comrades in the neighborhood branches, with heretofore narrow contacts, broadened their circle of friends in the course of the campaign. Every active Party member visited from 25 to 150 homes in his neighborhood. Comrades in unions were busy, together with their fellow workers, in canvassing work.

Teams of unionists were organized. Union brothers who had no more than organizational relationship at union meetings developed personal relationships through driving around the city, taking material from one election headquarters to the other, ringing door-bells together. Certainly, with such contacts it was possible to recruit. However, recruiting started *after* the city campaign, not during the most intense periods. It started then because its importance was clearly brought to the attention of the membership, because the Party became convinced that Party building is an integral part of carrying out the *line of the Party.*

But is it not a fact that in the midst

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a campaign the workers are more intensely interested than after the campaign? Is it not a fact that people are politically much more responsive during the campaign than after it? We marvel at the inconsistency of the development of Party building. It develops after the high tension of the political campaign subsides, when many of the most active workers in an election campaign decide to rest to overcome the fatigue resulting from intensive electioneering. We have two approaches to this question:

One is that while we have made many contacts in the course of the campaign, we are so busy visiting voters, speaking at or attending mass meetings, and working in various organizations and clubs, that we are not able in such a period simultaneously to counter the Red-baiting, build a successful campaign, attend branch meetings, give attention to dues collection, and recruit new members.

This approach has within it the elements of the "Red-scare among the Reds." It has within it opportunism in practice, a convenient, easiest way out of not applying the line of the Party from political analysis to organizational consolidation.

The other approach, that of selecting those co-workers in a political campaign in whom we have full confidence as a result of our close work with them, and inviting them to join our organization right in the heat and tension of a political campaign, is not only the correct application of the line of the Party, but, in the long run, the easier, faster and healthier way of recruiting and consolidating our Party organization.

Recently I had a very interesting conversation with a leader in a mass organization. The organization has over 30,000 members in the state of Washington and enjoys immense political prestige. The Communists in it constitute a very small group. This organization has been active in the campaign; it has several legislative measures at stake at the next legislature in Olympia. Since the primary campaign the number of members recruited from this organization could be counted on the fingers of one hand. When a leading comrade in the organization was asked why recruiting was so poor, the answer was, "Well, I have given a lot of consideration to the problem of recruiting, but I don't know whether a man in my position should stick his neck out and ask people to join the Party."

Certainly, we don't want our comrades to become careless to recruit indiscriminately, but we do expect them to approach those in whom they have complete confidence and trust. We asked the comrade referred to: "Have you such people in your organization? Do you come in contact with them?" The answer was, "Oh, with dozens and dozens of them. People I trust, people who, I am sure, even if they would refuse to join, would respect my political affiliation and probably admire me for it."

Yet this comrade has been an official of the state organization for nearly a year, and has failed to recruit a single member for fear that he may "stick his neck out"! This is not a singular example. This happens to be a pretty general situation. By intensifying our fight for consistency in following the line of the Party, for Party building, we will overcome

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these tendencies and thereby accelerate the tempo of our growth.

IMPROVING THE PARTY BUILDING IN THE BRANCHES

It is often said by functionaries of the Party: "The district or the county organizations never tire of 'ringing the fire alarm,' for dues collections, for recruiting. We have to find some other way of assuring 100 per cent regular dues payment. There must be some other method of increasing the tempo of our recruiting than this fire brigade system."

Certainly, "ringing the fire bells" month in and month out to bring up dues payments, to intensify recruiting, is bad business. There is only one thing that is worse—looking for magic short-cuts to the solution of Party growth and consolidation. To the comrades who say that "you can't visit members all the time," we say: "How can we apply any basic remedy without applying it to the patient, without visiting the delinquent member, the comrade who is uninterested for one reason or another in branch meetings, or without finding any other contact with him? The solution cannot be a 'mystery.' It must be a practical and sensible approach to every individual member of the Party."

Recently a class in organization supplied 57 reasons as answers to the question of "Why poor dues payments, poor attendance, poor recruiting?" It is evident that the 57 reasons can be eliminated, not by 57 remedies, but by finding the main cause that will proceed to solve the 57 varieties of weaknesses of a branch. That is the development of *leadership* in the branch.

The problem should not be whether or not we shall visit members to collect dues. The problem must be how we are to visit them; how we are to approach them; how we are to discuss their problems with them; how we are to make them regularly attending members who recruit, pay dues, and participate in the further consolidation of our Party.

Every district has good experiences and bad ones; good branches and bad ones. But in the main, the fundamental problem that Comrade Stachel discussed in his report is the same all over. The situation improves only to the extent that Party recruiting and dues payments—that is, Party consolidation—become a part of carrying out the Party's political objectives. The district, section, and branch leaderships must always be conscious of the importance of Party building. It is a well known fact that while the higher committees constantly engage in thorough discussions of the big political events, the branches are not so engaged. As a matter of fact, the branches discuss these questions infrequently—and then very sketchily. They do discuss dues and recruiting, but here again, without really tackling the problems. If our higher committees gave increased attention to Party building, our lower organizations would increase and improve their political discussions.

In Kings County, the largest section of our organization in the Northwest District, with 1,800 members on its rolls, the Party has been of late falling down on recruiting and dues payments. After five consecutive weeks of feeble recruiting in the midst of an election campaign, we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called together the branch leaders, and, although it is not our custom to supersede the county leadership at any time, we decided, because of this alarming situation, that Comrade Raport* address the branch organizations on the need for speedily improving this phase of our work. In his talk to the sixty-odd branches, Comrade Raport brought home to our leading comrades the realization that they cannot regard their branches as units in themselves, but as part of a district-wide and nationwide fighting political Party. He pointed out that a branch membership of 25 often underestimates the seriousness of the problem when payment is made for only 20 dues stamps, because it fails to see what this means—that this becomes a deficiency—not of five, but of 60 times five, or 300, viewed only as the county organization; and, for the approximately 300 branches of the district—a deficiency of 1,500. When we deal with a district membership of 4,500 and a dues payment of 3,000, then it becomes a major problem. But it becomes even a graver problem when such shortages in dues payment are seen on a national scale. Comrade Raport showed how little neglects result in tremendous discrepancies and great losses. He pointed out, likewise, that if we permit looseness in dues payments we tend to permit them in recruiting and in holding our new members.

This approach made a considerable impression upon those present, as can already be seen from the results. Up to the time of the meeting, October 18, dues payments in King County for the current month amounted to 450. The remainder of the month brought it to nearly 1,400. The same can be said as regards recruiting. At the time of the meeting the figure for the month was only 18; by the end of the month it was increased to 50.

To us in the Northwest District. Comrade Stachel's report is of the greatest help in our efforts to overcome our big political weakness. In the light of that report and of the recent visit of Comrades Browder and Stachel, we are intensifying our efforts to make Party building part of our carrying out of the Party's policy.

* District Secretary, Communist Party, Northwest District.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANENT THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE editors of *The Communist* have received the following letter from a professional branch in the Middle West:

"Dear Comrades:

"The article in the September issue of *The Communist,* entitled 'The Communist Party and the Professionals,' by Comrade William Z. Foster, has been received by our professional branch as very timely, instructive and thought-provoking. Its discussion cleared up many misconceptions, and helped reorientate many of our comrades in a very clear and perhaps forceful manner, out of a partially sectarian, petty-bourgeois and non-Leninist dislocation.

"The lessons gained from it are invaluable. In the course of the discussion, however, one particular statement came up for considerable comment. Most of our medical comrades took exception to the statement that the American Medical Association 'is reactionary not only politically but also medically.' The criticism was tactlessly made that 'That's the trouble when a layman designs to discuss the problems in a professional sphere of which he knows nothing.'

"This sectarian statement was then criticized on two points, namely: (1) that without question Comrade Foster had the expert advice of medical comrades perhaps better orientated than many of us, and (2) it is wrong and sectarian for medical men to take the attitude that a layman cannot rightly criticize the profession, for, it was aphoristically stated, 'A man can tell a good egg from a bad one without being able to lay one.'

"The function of the A.M.A., it was argued, is not as an organization to provide the initiative in medical progress, but as a regulatory mechanism to restrain the initiative of harmfully advocated policies. In doing this, not being infallible, it often errs by restraining good procedures and passing poor ones. In this way it does at times act in a reactionary manner. But this does not justify it being stamped 'reactionary medically.'

"But, we showed further, if the A.M.A. has neglected to take the initiative in medical progress and research (except for a very limited number of research grants) it is because of this neglect acting 'reactionary medically.'

"We continued further to analyze what was meant by 'reactionary medically.' It was shown that organized medicine has on numerous occasions in the past acted as a burden on the advance of medical progress, classic examples of which are Pasteur, Lister, Semmelweiss, etc.

"Then, further, since we readily admit organized medicine's leadership's reactionary political role, it should be readily seen that as a result of this role a retarding effect is exerted on the progress of medical science.

"Then also, as a result of its economic tie-up with commercial pharmaceutical interests, it is inevitable that some of the medicaments are prematurely or even wrongly admitted into the armamentarium of medical therapeusis, only to be rejected by clinical trial of a more thorough type, *e.g.,* di-nitrophenol experiences, and particularly the overwhelming commercial exploitation of certain scientifically useful products such as the vitamins, the hormones, and other 'panaceaic' remedies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"All these effects being interrelated and interdependent thus to a certain extent justify the accusation that the A.M.A. is reactionary medically as well. All these result from two grave misconceptions of organized medicine:

"1. Emphasis of the commercial value of medical practice over its social value.

"2. An often pseudo-scientific evaluation of medical progress as opposed to a consciously applied dialectical approach.

"It was finally concluded that in effect Comrade Foster's statement was correct, but that perhaps it should have been less bluntly and more correctly, or possibly more euphemistically, stated if it read, 'reactionary not only politically, but also *often in effect* medically.'

"We pass on the result of this discussion and the criticism for whatever value it may have. Should the responsible comrades see fit to comment on this, we feel sure that such comment will receive due consideration and appreciation.

"Comradely yours,
"Medical director of professional branch."

COMRADE FOSTER'S REPLY

In replying to the above letter I should like, before going into the main question of whether or not the A.M.A. is "reactionary medically," to say a word about the contention of "most of our medical comrades" in the branch discussion to the effect that a "layman" like myself is not qualified to make a characterization of the medical policy of the A.M.A.

Such a point of view cannot be accepted by Marxists. It is a remnant of the guildism characteristic of bourgeois professionals: the tendency to conceive of their professions as a sort of mystery quite beyond the understanding of all outsiders. It is in this narrow craft and caste spirit that we find engineers arguing that only trained engineers can know the real course of industry; artists contending that only artists are really qualified to explain art, etc. Such people try to make intellectual monopolies of their occupations, to build Chinese walls of incomprehensibility around them.

But Marxists do not recognize such unscalable technical barriers. One need not be an expert in the details of a profession in order to understand its general tendency, although, of course, the more detailed knowledge one has the better. If this were not true, then it would have been impossible for Marxian theoreticians, especially Engels and Lenin, to make their profound scientific analysis of the wide field of science, art and letters.

So far as my passing such a general opinion on the A.M.A. is concerned, it did not require much Marxian skill or detailed medical knowledge. That the A.M.A. is reactionary medically is so obvious that any reasonably informed person should be able to perceive it without serious difficulty.

Now let us view some of the outstanding facts that stamp the A.M.A. as "reactionary medically." But first a definition is necessary: when I speak of the A.M.A. in this sense I refer to the Fishbein clique of reactionaries who control it and dictate its policies. Doubtless the bulk of the medical profession is progressively inclined, both politically and medically, and one would have to be blind not to see the tremendous technical progress made by American medicine in recent years.

To begin with, we are agreed that the A.M.A. is reactionary politically. It is dominated by the big pharmaceutical companies and well-to-do physicians, and it is tied up with a whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

series of other reactionary economic and political influences and interests. Hence, especially in social legislation, most of which has a direct bearing upon the people's health, the A.M.A. is usually found either openly or covertly on the side of reaction. This is being dramatically illustrated by its present fight against the Roosevelt administration's progressive health program.

The reactionary political policy of the A.M.A. unavoidably has a retarding effect upon the technique of medical practice itself; for, as you correctly state, scientific technique and politics are directly related to each other. To see this basic fact demonstrated graphically in its extremes, all we have to do is to glance at the Soviet Union and at Nazi Germany. In the former instance, science (including medicine), under a developing socialist system, is flourishing and expanding; while in the latter case, under a decaying, fascized capitalist system, it is stagnating and withering. Because of this interdependence of politics and technique, it should be clear that the wide extension of medical services which the government health program involves, would surely bring about many improvements in medical knowledge and technique. It should also be clear that the A.M.A., in fighting against this program, is acting in a reactionary manner, "not only politically, but also medically"—not only "in effect," but actually!

This is only one instance of the reactionary technical influence of the A.M.A. It has in many other ways directly stifled or checked medical techniques that did not profit the financial interests controlling the A.M.A. One glaring example of this is the long-continued hindering of the development of physio-therapy in American medical practice.

But the reactionary character medically of the A.M.A. is seen fundamentally in its basic approach to the health question. Influenced by capitalistic considerations, its leadership cultivates the medical profession primarily upon the basis of profit, not of health service to the people. This profit motive leads the A.M.A. into a whole maze of reactionary practices, both political and technical, which are inimical to the people's health.

A real people's health program must have as its starting point the organized development of a strong and healthy people. This requires good economic conditions, supported by a sound education of the people in the ways of proper living, including physical culture, nutrition, mental hygiene, etc. And, needless to add, all these measures of sickness prevention must be backed up by the most scientifically organized and thoroughgoing curative system.

The policy of the A.M.A. has little in common with the development of such a basic health program. On the contrary, its influence is largely turned against it. While, as you say, the A.M.A. is ostensibly only a means "to restrain the initiative of harmfully advocated policies," in reality it has long been a sort of general dictator in matters of health. Its word has become almost decisive in the shaping of health legislation, in the education and practice of physicians, in the establishment of medical technique, in the health education of the masses, etc. This powerful influ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence it has long used either to play down or to oppose outright many of the elementary measures necessary for the systematic building of the people's vigor and their education in the ways of health. Except in the case of the prevention of contagious diseases, its conceptions of a health program hardly go beyond the curing of people after they have become sick. The idea of actually building the people's health is quite foreign, and often repugnant, to it. The A.M.A. keeps always in mind primarily the narrow interests of its own profession and of the financial interests behind it. That all this hold-back effect may be summed up correctly under the term "reactionary medically," is obvious.

Fortunately, however, with the current rise of the people's health movement, the arbitrary power of the reactionary A.M.A. moguls is being severely shaken. The people themselves are taking a hand in the matter. They are making a political issue of the health question, and, naturally enough, in order even to begin to move seriously towards a real health program they have come into collision with the A.M.A. heads. At present this people's opposition to the A.M.A. appears to be only political; but eventually it will also take on the character of opposition to the A.M,A.'s conceptions of health work and medical technique.

As Communists we cannot allow ourselves to be tied to such a narrow and reactionary conception of medicine as that of the A.M.A. We are interested not only in developing health work in the sense of improving and extending "the art of healing," but above all in the prevention of sickness by literally building up the people's health. A people's health program is quite a different thing from the medical guild-like policy of the A.M.A. Hence, we must be the champions, especially our physician-comrades, in fighting for all the political, economic, educational and technical measures necessary to advance a true people's health program. And in the measure that we do this we are bound to find ourselves more or less in opposition to A.M.A. policy on various fronts, not only political and social, but also medical.

We do not have to wait until after the revolution in order to begin supporting these broader principles of a people's health program. Their realization here and now, so far as possible, is a major task of the democratic front, and we should try to educate the movement to that effect. When we grasp more clearly the nature of such a broad people's health program and begin to work seriously for its realization, then, as we encounter the A.M.A.'s hostile attitude, we will have no difficulty in understanding that the A.M.A. (under its present leadership and policies) "is reactionary not only politically but also medically."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

THE FRANCO-SOVIET PACT AND THE "MEN OF MUNICH"

BY GABRIEL PERI *

L'Humanité, daily organ of the Communist Party of France; Paris, November 5, 1938

WHY DID President Edouard Herriot speak out with such vehemence at the Radical-Socialist Party Congress at Marseilles against eventual resurrection of the policy of the barbed-wire cordon [around the Soviet Union—Trans.]? Why did he subject Daladier and Bonnet to a veritable interpellation? Why did he warn his party against relaxation of Franco-Soviet relations?

Why? Because the dangers pointed out by the President of the Chamber of Deputies are very real. There is no use hiding them. Edouard Herriot does a great service to peace by revealing their gravity. Since September 30, the Franco-Soviet pact is threatened. The German press daily advises us that its denunciation, or at the very least its quiet suspension, is commanded by the logic of Munich. France as yet has not publicly replied to these instructions, and this silence is interpreted in Berlin as acquiescence.

The question then is clearly posed: What is the state of Franco-Soviet relations after Munich?

The attitude, fully in accordance with international law and the interests of peace, assumed by the U.S.S.R. during the crisis of last September, will be recalled. Litvinov, at Geneva, gave their just due to the falsehoods circulated by the press of Georges Bonnet and Mr. Chamberlain.

Perhaps too little has been said of the noteworthy statement of the former Czechoslovakian Minister, M. Vavrecka, regarding the conditions in which the accord of September 18 was imposed upon Czechoslovakia. M. Vavrecka explains that the U.S.S.R. constantly remained prepared to fulfil all its obligations—its obligations as a treaty signatory, if, in conformity with the treaty itself, France helped Czechoslovakia—its obligations as a signatory of the Covenant of the League of Nations, if the mutual assistance pact were not to function because France sidestepped her duty.

M. Vavrecka declared, and another Czech Minister, quite a reactionary figure, M. Beran, confirmed, that Czechoslovakia had been directly threatened with the hostility of France and Great Britain if, in these conditions, she accepted Soviet asistance.

The Munich conference then was prepared and called, with the Soviet government excluded. Since September 30, the Nazi and fascist newspapers, those published in Berlin and

* Communist Member of the Chamber of Deputies; Vice-Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, Chamber of Deputies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rome and those published in Paris, insistently repeat: Munich sounded the knell of the Franco-Soviet pact! . . .

And what does the responsible French government reply? It does not reply, or when it does reply, it mouths an anti-Communist harangue. Well, in the political history of France, a very exact coincidence exists between the offensive of the forces of reaction and anti-Soviet intrigues. André Wurmser comments quite correctly in the latest number of *Russia Today:*

"The struggle against the Soviet Union, the recognition of Wrangel, the support of the Whites, the Black Sea intervention—this is the dictatorial power of Clemenceau, the National Bloc of Millerand. The recognition of the Soviet Union—this is the Herriot government. The rupture of trade negotiations corresponds to Poincare's return to power. The renewal of friendship follows the return of the democrats to the government. The non-aggression pact is signed by Edouard Herriot. . . . And when the French government, spurning signed obligations, set aside the Czecho-Soviet pact, a complement of the Franco-Soviet pact, without consulting either of its two allies, Daladier obtained in the Chamber of Deputies a vote of confidence from Jean Chiappe [notorious fascist ex-police chief of Paris.—Trans.] for the full powers which a large section of the majority that had brought him to power refused to him.

"Thus the cause of Franco-Soviet friendship in France has followed, not the rising or falling curve of any party, but the varying strength of the forces of freedom and democracy."

Reread the speech made in the House of Commons by Lord Strabolgi, published in an excellent work, *Those Who Dare to Reply to Hitler. . . .*

Lord Strabolgi, who I suppose will not be treated as a "hireling of Moscow," declares:

"But if there is a man who has succeeded in tearing defeat from the jaws of victory, it is indeed our Prime Minister during his visit to Berchtesgaden.

"We have been told: 'What would you have done if you were in his place at Berchtesgaden?' I reply unhesitatingly: Here is what I would have done (I speak in images, of course): I would have told Hitler: 'I cannot continue this discussion. I have another appointment in Moscow.' I would have climbed back into my airplane and I would have flown to see Mr. Stalin. It does not matter what I would have said to Mr. Stalin. But it would have made the Germans reflect." (Retranslated from the French.—Trans.)

Yes, the collaboration of France and Great Britain with the U.S.S.R. would have saved Czechoslovakia and forced war to retreat.

After the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia, after the loosening of Franco-British ties, the preservation and strengthening of the Franco-Soviet pact is a fundamental element of France's existence. It is, with Spain, the supreme barrier. Let it be overthrown, and there will be nothing more and the hour for settling the accounts announced in *Mein Kampf* will have come.

The answer will be given: the pact is ineffective since the disappearance of Czechoslovakia! A lying argument to which the Nazi Press itself has given the reply. For, after all, if the pact had become ineffective after Munich, why would Hitler demand its denunciation with so much greater insistence after September 30?

The 1935 treaty, had it been consolidated by France, would unquestionably have spared Europe the disaster of this autumn. This treaty must be saved, it must be strengthened, it must be completely fulfilled. The French government which would refuse to do this would commit a second act of treason; it would accept being "Munich to the second power."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

FURTHER LIGHT ON EARLY NEGRO SOLIDARITY

TO THE Editors of *The Communist:*
Since writing my article, "Primitive Negro Solidarity, New Light from Brazil," published in the November issue of *The Communist,* I have come upon some additional and corroborative material which may be of interest, and which I herewith submit.

With regard to the Negro's resistance to slavery and oppression, Henry Bamford Parkes, in his recently published *History of Mexico,* has the following footnote (p. 95):

"Negroes had more physical strength—and also more aggressiveness than Indians, and a number of them—twenty thousand by the middle of the sixteenth century—had been imported for work in the sugar plantations of Cuernavaca and in the *tierra caliente* of Vera Cruz. In spite of their relatively small numbers, the Spaniards were more afraid of Negro rebellions than of risings among the Indians. Mendoza hanged a number of them.

"Early in the next century it was rumored that on a certain evening there would be a Negro rebellion in the City of Mexico. After nightfall the Spaniards, waiting anxiously in their homes, were terrified by a noise of trampling feet. The noise proved afterwards to have been caused by a herd of runaway pigs. The Spaniards, nevertheless, exacted vengeance for their fright by executing thirty-two of the Negroes. By intermarriage with the Indians the Negroes eventually disappeared as a separate race. The areas where the Negroes were most numerous—Morelos and Vera Cruz—have in modern times been the areas where peasant movements have been most aggressive. This has sometimes been attributed to the influences of Negro blood."

In his book, *Casa Grande e Senzala (Manor House and Slave Hut),* Gilberto Freyre, world famous Brazilian anthropologist, remarks (footnote, p. 177):

"The Negroes, indeed, were by no means passive. On the contrary, they offered a more effective resistance to white exploitation than did the Indians."

One Brazilian writer, Oliveira Vianna, having put forth the thesis that there had never been any such thing as a class struggle in Brazil, finds himself contradicted by another writer, Astrogildo Pereira, who states:

"An authentic class struggle there was, extending over centuries of our history, culminating in the great and heroic episode represented by the formation of the Republic of Palmares, and with the epic figures of Zumby, our Negro Spartacus, in the foreground." (From *Sociologia ou apologetica?* [*Sociology or Apologetics?*] by Astrogildo Pereira.)

The Republic of Palmares was the African state which was set up by fugitive slaves in Brazil, from 1630 to 1697, as described in my article.

With comradely greetings,

SAMUEL PUTNAM

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

HOW NOT TO STRUGGLE FOR LATIN AMERICA

THE COMING STRUGGLE FOR LATIN AMERICA. By Carleton Beals, 401 pp., J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, $3.00.

CARLETON BEALS is one of America's foremost writers on Latin American affairs, and one of the most prolific. But after reading the latest product of his pen, *The Coming Struggle for Latin America,* one regrets that his talents were not devoted to greater thoroughness rather than added volume.

The struggle for Latin America is not only coming—it is here. The central struggle which pervades the present world scene, the struggle between democracy and fascism, also dominates the Western Hemisphere and its Latin sector. This is proved graphically and convincingly, in the first chapters of Beals' book and then unceremoniously rejected, not so convincingly, in the later ones.

Beals the intrepid reporter has a natural gift for recording events. Beals the political interpreter, however, lacks the scientific world outlook and method of investigation. He does not possess, seemingly, the faculty for persistent, objective probing for the truth underlying the facts he gathers. In this he is not alone. He typifies a number of American foreign correspondents of the post-war period. Shocked by the sordidness of the bourgeois world, disgusted with its callousness and hypocrisy, but lacking the clear perspective of historical materialism, they become professional sceptics, concealing their own superficiality by assuming and assiduously cultivating an air of cynicism. Thus, people who even call themselves anti-fascists, sometimes become apologists for fascism and, in time, even tools of it.

THE FASCIST THREAT TO LATIN AMERICA

The first three chapters of Beals' book deal with fascist economic penetration, spy plots and political intrigues. In these, the best chapters, he shows a keen sense of observation coupled with an ability to draw pertinent deductions. Summarizing fascist activity in the hemisphere, he asks:

"What does all this add up to? Is the struggle for markets, for trade, a sufficient explanation? Is it merely the need for raw supplies, the need to dispose of war materials?

"Why then the intensive effort not merely to add Germans abroad to the Reich's great 'spiritual' empire, but to convert native governments and peoples to Nazism?" (P. 82.)

And he answers:

"Obviously the stakes are much larger than mere commercial interests. Today international trade is the handmaiden of future war and conquest." (P. 82.)

"The whole Teutonic Latin American crusade, carried on in such grandiose scale and so successfully, apparently has for its goal an ambitious achievement of world power." (P. 83.)

Nor does he ignore the connection between fascist aggression in Europe and fascist penetration and activity in this hemisphere.

"And thus the battle by Germany and Italy to seat the puppet Franco in power in Spain has been also a battle to control the whole Latin world and its rich resources. It has been a battle for the American continent, not merely for Spain. Franco is merely the cheap tool of a scheme of imperial aggrandizement. That scheme casts its dark shadow across the Americans. It lies at our doorsteps." (P. 174.)

Well stated. But what are we to do about it? Here Beals is completely at a loss. Afraid to draw the only logical conclusion, namely, the need for combatting fascism as the main menace, he devotes the rest of his book, ironical though it may sound, to undermin-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing his own premise. Startled by his own revelation, or rather, perhaps, by the implications of mass struggles that it implies, he discovers before long that the real danger is no longer fascism, but—the Roosevelt Good-Neighbor Policy!

To arrive at this profundity is certainly a feat of journalistic acrobatics. Let us follow the author through a few of his mental gyrations. In one place he calls upon the Roosevelt administration to end its farcical and false neutrality policy. He advises it to give unstinted aid to the Spanish republic, because this more than anything else "would checkmate Hitler and Mussolini in their designs on Latin America." (P. 168.) But a moment later he becomes morally indignant at the very idea of the United States answering fascist propaganda with democratic propaganda: "Our country should at once get out of the propaganda business in foreign lands." (P. 310.) As to the government's attempts to counteract fascist trade activities in the hemisphere, he asks: ". . . why should our State Department work itself up into such a lather to protect American business?" (P. 314.) On one page he ridicules the possibility of American isolation from the rest of the world; on another, he advocates American isolation from even the rest of the hemisphere!

Bitterly sarcastic, he refers to the Good-Neighbor Policy as "Hull-abaloo and grandiloquent blah-blah." He accuses it of serving the interests of the tyrants and dictators of Latin America: "We [the United States] are showing friendship to the governments, not to the people of Latin America." (P. 302.) Yet elsewhere, as has been shown, he condemns Roosevelt and Hull for interfering in Southern affairs with their "propaganda business" of advocating democracy! Is the preaching of democracy a sign of friendship to the tyrants or the peoples of Latin America? Beals knows the answer; for he himself admits that for the Southern dictators "the word 'democracy' is synonymous with ratpoison, Bolshevism, and atheism" (p. 62.); and that "for Latin America, democracy is still a revolutionary concept, capable of tumbling down governments." He adds: "To advocate it is propaganda. It is propaganda far more revolutionary there, far more an alien doctrine than either totalitarianism or communism." (P. 294.) As you can see, Beals is a great man of principle. Come what may, he stands as the mighty bulwark opposed to all "propaganda," to all "alien" doctrines—even, or shall we say, especially—democracy!

But it is not our desire to heap ridicule on the head of Mr. Beals. It is he himself who has done so. We are only trying to follow him in his ramblings, in order to single out his central theme. To the extent that he has one at all, it can be stated as follows:

Growing fascist penetration of the hemisphere is bad—bad for Latin America, bad for the United States. But the influence of the United States is also bad—just as bad—for the people to the south of us. For them fascist influence means dictatorial rule. But the influence of the United States, even the influence of the Good-Neighbor Policy, also means super-exploitation and dictatorial rule. Hence, according to our author, it makes *little difference* to the peoples of these countries whether the influence of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis or that of the United States is predominant (!).

Of course, it does not mean that Mr. Beals presents this position in just so many words or with this ordered reasoning. But the serious student of the subject matter under discussion is entitled to look for the sum total and draw the full conclusions of the author's statements. According to him there is "only one struggle of any importance" in Latin America, and that is "the struggle against militarism, against feudal enslavement, against mass serfdom, against foreign domination." (P. 380.)

Certainly, "militarism," "feudal enslavement," and "foreign domination" must be swept away. But, these demands remain abstract, empty phrases, unless they arise from an earnest intention to undertake struggle for them along the concrete course that the specific present-day period of history has opened up for us. What is this course, if not barring the way of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio conspiracy to fascize the world? And what is this fascist penetration of the Western Hemisphere which Mr. Beals in his early chapters so well notes, but the attempt to make Munich the capital of the Americas?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not to recognize this as the grave imminent danger confronting us, not to turn one's analysis into a program of struggle for defeating that danger, is, Mr. Beals, capitulation to that danger!

The author sets himself up as the great champion of the Latin American masses, as the dauntless warrior, the irreconcilable foe of imperialism—all imperialism. "Don Quixote rides the Pampas," remarks Beals wittily; but little does he realize that the rider is none other than himself!

First, Beals' thesis ignores what he himself has told us of the character and objectives of fascist penetration. It indicates a gross lack of comprehension of the main issue which divides the world today and an irresponsible, flippant attitude towards the fate of mankind. Only one quotation from the book need be cited to show the author's narrow horizons. Speaking of the Chaco struggle he wanders into a prophetic mood, observing:

". . . perhaps half a century hence, the settlement and control of that area will prove far more important in the new balance of world affairs than all the fretful struggles of a dying Europe. Hitler looked at from the perspective of centuries is a drop in the bucket compared to the fateful tide of Chaco events." (P. 328.)

"Dying Europe!" Then why become perturbed over Spain, over Hitler's rape of Austria and Czechoslovakia, or over German and Italian penetration in Latin America? If Europe is dying, then why stop Hitler from taking the corpse? If Europe is dying, then why fear European fascist influence in the Western Hemisphere? After all, the Chaco struggle was of far greater significance (!).

In this single paragraph Beals virtually gives away his whole position. He exposes his lack of any genuine internationalism, his shallowness, his inability to understand Latin America and its relative place in the present world panorama. He exposes, particularly, his utter inability to size up the menace of fascism—this ocean of misery which is for him but a "drop in the bucket."

THE MEANING OF THE GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Secondly, this thesis makes a totally incorrect evaluation of the Roosevelt Good-Neighbor Policy and its relievancy to the struggle against both fascism and imperialism in Latin America.

Prior to the New Deal, the United States pursued a distinctly imperialist bad-neighbor policy towards the peoples and governments south of the Rio Grande. This pre-Roosevelt policy was dictated by Wall Street in the defense of its ever greater financial commitments in Latin America. From 1920 to 1930, American investments in these countries increased from approximately two billion to close to six billion dollars. The government of the United States during this period assumed the role of both policeman and bill-collector for the Chase National Bank. Its diplomacy was aimed at safeguarding these investments, at ensuring the largest possible returns on them, and at "persuading" reluctant governments and peoples into accepting the further blessings of Yankee imperialism.

Super-profits could be extracted from those countries only where the labor movement was docile and the standard of living lower than low. The marines followed the dollar and Wall Street puppet governments followed the marines. By force and violence, through coercion and corruption, American imperialism robbed these countries of their natural wealth, enforced abysmally low living and wage standards, and in alliance with the most reactionary feudal circles, blocked their every effort to emerge from a semi-colonial status.

Yet, this very concentration on the exploitation of the human and material resources led to a narrowing of market possibilities. Latin America found it more difficult to continue, and absolutely impossible to expand its purchases of American products, whether of capital goods for native industry or manufactured commodities for the wide masses. This was a contributing factor leading to the economic and financial collapse of 1929.

With the economic breakdown of that year, the export of American capital suddenly ceased. Its abruptness was matched only by its thoroughness. Together with the great drop in world commodity prices which affected raw material and agricultural products most adversely, the crisis only led in due time to a tremendous weakening of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States trade with Latin America. In 1930, U. S. trade with this region, although declining rapidly, was still in the neighborhood of six to seven hundred million dollars. By 1932 this had declined to less than one hundred million dollars.

This catastrophic state of the foreign trade of the U.S.A. was the economic lever pressing for a change in its hemisphere policy. That a change was absolutely necessary, became even more evident when the fascist powers began to initiate their policy of economic penetration and trade rivalry in Latin America.

The Good-Neighbor policy as developed by Roosevelt over a period of time aimed to serve therefore a two-fold objective: to help U.S. economic recovery by stimulating trade with Latin America through reciprocal trade agreements; and to counteract the growing fascist penetration which was a rising threat to America's national interests.

A NEW DEAL FOR LATIN AMERICA

But if these were the objectives they could not be realized without paralleling the New Deal for the United States with a New Deal for Latin America. Roosevelt, the bourgeois-liberal and democrat, soon realized that economic recovery could return, that democracy could survive only by increasing the purchasing power of the American people. Of course, this was contrary to the program and interests of the reactionary circles of finance capital whose spokesmen, because of this, adopted a more and more hostile and antagonistic attitude towards the President and the New Deal. The concomitant for Latin America of this New Deal policy was seen by the most progressive New Dealers as aiding our Southern neighbors to increase their own purchasing powers, to expand their market possibilities and therefore also their trade relations with the United States.

Only such a course, based upon cooperation with the Latin American countries in their desire to develop industrially, to achieve full economic and political independence, could win their friendship and help defeat the trade methods of the fascist powers which were based upon a system of barter arrangement and exchange control.*

The failure to regain the Latin American market not only threatened the future of U.S. foreign trade, but was a threat to the very existence and success of the New Deal itself, as it made American economic recovery more difficult.

Therefore, the New Deal for Latin America made necessary as sharp a reversal of former U. S. hemisphere policy, just as the New Deal was a reversal of the policies of Hoover toward the impoverished toiling masses of the United States. It meant curbing the excesses and abuses of imperialism; limiting and curtailing all practices which hinder the development of greater trade opportunities. It meant ending the policy of rule through brute oppression and the beginning of a policy fostering the ideals of democracy. This was necessary, not only in order to promote good will, but because, as long as oligarchic dictatorships were encouraged in the hemisphere, fascism would find fertile breeding ground. All of this, if carried out logically and consistently meant, furthermore, the pursuance of a policy which in time would lead to weakening the hold of Wall Street finance capital upon Latin America, thus delivering a telling blow at the very heart of the most reactionary section of American imperialism.

Thus, the policy of the Good Neighbor, if logically and consistently applied, is directed against the most predatory circles of American finance capital. But it coincides at the same time with the interests of large circles of American business, since it increases their opportunities for trade and commerce with Latin America. That is why this policy has received support, to a degree, from many sections of American business which are nevertheless opponents of the New Deal, in domestic spheres. This policy also corresponds to the need of the American people, as it increases the possibilities for jobs and economic recovery.

---

* Recently it has become clear to a number of the Latin American countries that this barter system was not advantageous to their own economies, since it has lowered the world price level of their products and made them virtually dependent upon the fascist states.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt's renunciation of America's former predatory policies is most clearly formulated in the Declaration of Principles adopted by the Buenos Aires Pan-American Conference on December 1, 1936, stating:

"That the following principles are accepted by the international American community: (a) Proscription of territorial conquest and that, in consequence, no acquisition made through violence shall be recognized; (b) Intervention by one state in the internal or external affairs of another state is condemned; (c) Forcible collection of pecuniary debts is illegal; and (d) Any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of consideration, or full arbitration, or through operation of international justice."

In practice this has meant the renunciation of the Platt Amendment which gave the United States the right to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba; the withdrawal of American troops from Latin American soil, concretely Haiti; and the recognition of the full sovereignty of the southern states.

Despite the attempts of Beals to ridicule the Good-Neighbor policy, he himself cannot help but give certain grudging recognition to its positive achievements in the following words:

"If one chalks up the fine works of the Roosevelt administration in Latin American matters, not against its own shortcomings, but against those of half a century or more of relations, then Roosevelt stands out as the most original and constructive executive in that respect that has ever sat in the White House. No one can take away the merited praise for these worthier achievements." (P. 244.)

And speaking of America's attitude toward the Mexican oil appropriations, he adds:

"This forbearance and recognition of Mexico's sovereignty shows more restraint and decency than could be expected of any other great power on earth today [Might he not have said—but for the Soviet Union?]. It is a particularly noble example in this hour of international aggression and brutality." (P. 243.)

Beals points out that the Good-Neighbor policy has not been consistently applied, and that it has not gone deep enough. Undeniably, that is true. Within the State Department itself, there are men such as Welles and Caffery who try to obstruct the consistent application of this policy. This struggle within the State Department is to be seen, for example, in respect to Mexico. If Roosevelt is desirous of seeing an independent, democratic and prosperous Mexico, he must agree with and support the policies of the Cardenas government which aim to curb the super-exploitation practised by the foreign imperialist enterprises, to raise the wages of the Mexican workers, to give land to the propertyless peons, to make Mexico economically and politically independent. Only such policies as these can help expand the Mexican market and create a greater demand for foreign goods. That is why, contrary to Beals' unstinted praise of the Mexican policy of the U.S. State Department, we, while recognizing its positive aspects, criticize it for its diplomatic attempt to defend the reactionary designs of the American oil and land owners.

Instead of insisting upon immediate payment for oil and land properties, the government of the United States should extend credit facilities to Mexico, helping it move ahead upon its chosen course. Nor would this be altruism on our part. The economic development of Mexico, and its resultant prosperity, would open up an avenue for much greater trade and in turn help American recovery. The Good-Neighbor policy must therefore be a consistent policy, even though it means curbing the reactionary practices of the American oil, mining, utility, sugar and fruit investment interests.

The Good-Neighbor policy must likewise be extended to include the people of Puerto Rico, who to this very day are denied their democratic rights under the tyrannical rule of Governor Winship. Nor is it enough to preach democracy. The United States must insist on true democracy as the foundation for its economic and political alliances. We refer in particular to such countries as Brazil, where despite the anti-Nazi statements of Vargas, Nazism may yet be the victor unless the flood-gates of democracy are opened.

Hence, the conclusions to be drawn are certainly not those of Mr. Beals. Instead of opposing the Good Neighbor policy, we must

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oppose the failure to apply it consistently. We must combat the attempts of certain forces in the State Department to nullify this progressive policy in the interests of the most reactionary circles of finance capital. The Good-Neighbor policy has already shown positive accomplishments. It has not only been a deterrent to further fascist penetration, but has also given the countries of Latin America an opportunity to move more rapidly on to the highway of democracy and national emancipation. The logical pursuance of the Good-Neighbor policy is, therefore, not only to the interests of the people of the United States but to those of Latin America as well. It is the growing labor and progressive movement of the United States, in alliance with the labor and democratic forces of Latin America, which will create the necessary guarantees for the further consistent and successful application of this policy.

All of this is particularly essential in the present post-Munich world. For the "peace" established at Munich creates a great danger to the peace and welfare of the Western Hemisphere. Every strengthening of the fascist axis strengthens fascist trends in Latin America and pro-fascist circles in the United States. The Munich Pact bids fair to become the beginning for another agreement at the expense of Latin America and the national interests of the United States. Hitler's drive for colonies will under such conditions be directed towards the Western Hemisphere. Hitler's accomplices on this continent, Hoover, Trotsky and Co., are already preparing to leave the door open for further fascist advances. It would therefore be the height of folly to misunderstand the significance of world events for Latin America. If fascism is to be kept from America's shores, the democratic masses of the United States and Latin America must unite against further Munichs, especially the attempts to impose Munich on Spain and China. For if democracy is defeated in Spain, the barriers to fascism will thereby be lowered in the Americas.

AT THE SERVICE OF THE TROTSKY-FASCISTS

Up to this point, we have refrained from reference to one chapter of Beals' book which would indicate that he has an axe to grind. This chapter dealing with Communist activities in Latin America has all the earmarks of a Hearst-Trotsky hybrid. At its best, it is vituperation at its worst. Slanders, long ago slain by the arrows of truth, are here resuscitated, and new ones spawned. On this subject the author is not even a good journalist; he is simply a bad liar.

"When the U. S. bought Alaska," Beals states glibly, "we thought that Russia's imperialist ambitions in the Western Hemisphere had been forever checked." But, no. It "has made a new bid for power in the Americas." (P. 133.) And so, Mr. Beals calmly resurrects the old fascist-Trotskyite slander of "Red imperialism."

Does it not behoove Beals, the analyst and student, to answer: What do you mean, "Soviet imperialism"? Does the Soviet Union participate in the Latin American trade war —*can it do so,* by the very essence, the socialist essence, of its economy? Does it pursue a policy of economic penetration? Has it established spheres of predatory influence? Has it at any time or place followed a policy of territorial conquest? Not even Beals can overtly make these accusations. What then, makes it "imperialistic"? Mr. Beals has his own queer definition of imperialism. He makes the extremely vulgar charge that: "Every Communist, up to a certain point, is thus an agent for the Soviet government. . . ." (P. 135.) Since there are scores of thousands of Communists in Latin America, is this not enough to prove (for the cynical mind of Mr. Beals) that there is such a thing as Soviet "imperialism"? After all, people cannot be motivated by beliefs, by ideals. They must, according to him, be "agents." How thankful is the very Wall Street that Mr. Beals makes such an ado of fighting, for his contribution to its arsenal of weapons in the anti-Soviet and Red-baiting barrage!

The Soviet Union which, alone of all great powers, covets no foreign territory, which consistently and persistently struggles for peace against imperialistic intrigues, which has established complete freedom for the nationalities within its own borders is accused of "power politics" and what is more —believe it or not—of betraying loyalist Spain (!). (P. 169.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would take a volume to answer all the calumnies, distortions, fabrications and falsehoods concocted in the mind of Carleton Beals. Therefore, we shall treat only a few of these in order to expose the unprincipled character of all of them.

Sick to the stomach at the growing strength and influence of the Mexican Communist Party, Beals sets out to "prove" that the Communists in Mexico have nothing in common with the general progressive development of that country. To do so, he marshals two "facts." One, that the newly-established Party of the Mexican Revolution (P.R.M.), the Mexican form of the People's Front, "has established the principle that no Communist is eligible for membership." (P. 141.) Two, that the Communist Party find itself in such ill-repute, that "On April 18, 1938, the police raided the Mexico City headquarters of the Party and reportedly found a large collection of arms and dynamite." (P. 141.) What are the true facts?

One, on April 10 of this year a declaration of the Communist Party of Mexico defining its attitude towards the newly formed P.R.M. stated in part as follows:

"The Communist Party will give its most energetic support to the P.R.M., and all the Communists will belong to that Party through the different social organizations of which they are members."

And where did this statement appear? In no other place than *El Nacional*, the official daily newspaper of the P.R.M.!

Now as to point two. In the first place, there were no arms in the Party headquarters. And in the second place, there was no raid in the first place! And if Mr. Beals wants verification for this fact, he can also find it in the columns of *El Nacional* of April 19.

Turning to Peru, he makes another of his wild accusations. The Communist leaders in this country "are today holding plump bureaucratic jobs" (p. 145) under the dictatorship of Benavidas. And yet, as an "expert" on Peru, he knows as well as anyone, that the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party—Terreros and Puertocarrero—are at this very moment languishing in Peruvian prisons, and others—Rabines, Hurwitz, etc.,—are working in exile.

Coming to Chile, Beals ridicules the People's Front of that country and prophetically declares that it does not stand a ghost of a chance in the coming elections. "The real struggle, of course, "says he, "is between [Ross] the candidate of the present Executive and the former dictator Ibanez." (P. 154.) But, "of course," the people of Chile proved Beals a false prophet. For, on October 25, they elected Aguirre Cerda, the candidate of the People's Front, as President of Chile—the first victory of its kind in Latin America!

So much for the author's objectivity and honesty.

Carleton Beals starts out with a formal exposure of fascism, its methods and objectives in Latin America. He completes his book with an apology for it.

GIL GREEN.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATEST BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

CHINA'S FIGHT FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION, by *Chen Lin*, Workers Library Publishers, New York 10c

THE WAY THINGS ARE, by *Albert Maltz*, International Publishers, New York $1.50

UNION OF ALL SPANIARDS, by *Dolores Ibarruri (Pasionaria)*, Communist Party of Spain, Madrid-Barcelona.

JAPANESE TERROR IN CHINA, by *H. J. Timperley*, Modern Age Books, Inc., New York 75c

LORDS OF THE PRESS, by *George Seldes*, Julian Messner, Inc., New York $3.00

PRACTICAL BIRTH-CONTROL METHODS, by *Norman E. Himes, Ph. D.*, with medical collaboration of Abraham Stone, M.D., Modern Age Books, Inc., New York 95c

LIFE INSURANCE: INVESTING IN DISASTER, by *Mort and E. A. Gilbert*, Modern Age Books, Inc., New York.. 75c

THE LESSON OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA, by *Robert G. Spivack*, American League for Peace and Democracy, New York 5c

CORKY, by *Eric Lucas*, International Publishers, New York 25c

THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH, by *Harriet Silverman*, People's National Health Committee, New York 5c

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The January Issue Will Contain

A Full Index to The Communist for 1938

—of Subjects and Authors—

affording a ready reference to the important events, trends, and issues of the year.

The Index is designed especially to aid the readers of THE COMMUNIST in using the magazine as a text for group study and self-study. Full sets of 12 issues of THE COMMUNIST are available at

$2.40 per set

- -

Cut along this line and mail to

Date.....19.....

THE COMMUNIST
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D
New York, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription to THE COMMUNIST beginning with the.....19..... issue.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....

Regular subscription $2.00 per year for 12 monthly issues. For Canadian and foreign subscriptions add fifty cents.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Announcing—

THE PEOPLE'S BOOK BAZAAR

"From Coast to Coast!"

Beginning: Friday, December 9th
Ending: Saturday, December 31st

"FOR A HAPPY PROGRESSIVE NEW YEAR—GIVE BOOKS AS GIFTS!"

Here is a Partial List of Book Bazaars Opening on December 9th

Baltimore, Md.: 501a N. Eutaw St.
Berkeley, Calif.: 2475 Bancroft Way
Birmingham, Ala.: 1907 Fifth Ave., N.
Boston, Mass.: 8 Beach St.
Butte, Mont.: 205 E. Park St.
Cambridge, Mass.: 19 Dunster St.
Chicago, Ill.: 208 N. Wells St.
Cincinnati, Ohio: 540 Main St.
Cleveland, Ohio: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Denver, Colo.: 522 Mining Exch. Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa: 218 Youngerman Bldg.
Detroit, Mich.: 7 Sibley St.
Duluth, Minn.: 28 E. 1st St.
Grand Rapids, Mich.: 319 Bridge St.
Greensboro, N. C.: 210 E. Sycamore St.
Houston, Texas: 1009½ Congress
Indianapolis, Ind.: Meridian Life Bldg., Room 401
Los Angeles, Calif.: 224 S. Spring St.
Madison, Wisc.: 521 State St.
Milwaukee, Wisc.: 914 N. Plankinton Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn.: 631 Third Ave., So.
Newark, N. J.: 216 Halsey St.
New Haven, Conn.: 6 Church St.
New Orleans, La.: 130 Chartres St.
New York, N. Y.: 50 E. 13th St.
Oklahoma City, Okla.: 129½ W. Grand Ave.
Omaha, Nebr.: 516 Karbach Block
Philadelphia, Pa.: 104 S. 9th St.
Pittsburgh, Pa.: 648 Grant St.
Portland, Ore.: 201 Gerlinger Bldg.
Richmond, Va.: 301 N. 1st St.
St. Louis, Mo.: 3520 Franklin Ave.
St. Paul, Minn.: 26 E. 4th St.
Salt Lake City, Utah.: 74 W. 1st St., So.
San Diego, Calif.: 635 E. St.
San Francisco, Calif.: 170 Golden Gate Ave.
Seattle, Wash.: 701 Pine St.
Superior, Wisc.: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma, Wash.: 1004 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo, Ohio: 214 Michigan St.
Youngstown, Ohio: 114 E. Federal St.

THOUSANDS OF BOOKS AT BARGAIN PRICES!

This year you can serve yourself and the progressive movement by "Giving Books as Gifts" for the New Year: Books on history, art, literature, politics and political economy, biography and memoirs, journalism and reportage, science and psychology, Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union, world affairs and the struggle against war and fascism, will be available at these "People's Book Bazaars" at prices within your range.

●

For information as to your nearest Book Bazaar, write to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D **New York, N. Y.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books

FOR DECEMBER

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

A Marxist Introduction

By HOWARD SELSAM

A popular introduction to philosophy written for the average reader. It relates the most abstract philosophical problems to practical everyday events and issues. **$1.25**

HUNGER AND WORK

By JURGEN KUCZYNSKI

A survey of living conditions in England today. By a noted Marxian economist, author of "Labor Conditions in Western Europe" and "New Fashions in Wage Theory." **$1.50**

NEW PAMPHLETS

THE NEGRO AND THE CIVIL WAR

By Herbert Aptheker

10 cents

SALUD! Poems and Stories of Spain

By American Writers

10 cents

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D — New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED